Sir John Pakington and national education

Aldrich, Richard E

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON

AND

NATIONAL EDUCATION

by

Richard Edward Aldrich

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

King's College London

ABSTRACT

Sir John Pakington is one of the most neglected figures in the history of English education. In this study, which is principally concerned with the twenty years prior to the Education Act of 1870, an attempt is made to remedy that neglect by examining in detail Pakington's contribution to national education.

After a brief summary of Pakington's personal and political lives the main body of the work traces that contribution from his early interest in education in the decade of the 1850's. Three particular areas can be identified. The first is Pakington's commitment to a wide variety of educational associations and institutions throughout the country. The second is his championship of education within Parliament. His Bills of 1855 and 1857, the Act of 1856 and the union of Manchester educationists, the Newcastle Commission of 1858, the overthrow of Lowe, the Select Committee of 1865-6, and the Education Act of 1870, were all episodes in which he played a leading role. Pakington was a vital link between them all. Finally, though he left no major educational treatise as such, it has been possible to distil from his speeches and actions a concept of national education very different from that often ascribed to nineteenth-century Conservative politicians, and one which was genuinely concerned to improve both the quantity and quality of educational provision for the whole nation.

Pakington's contribution to national education was an individual one; both as a man and as a politician he was one of nature's independents. Neither he nor his concept of education fits easily into those categories which are often imposed upon the history of education in the nineteenth century. To that extent, and no more, this study is a reaffirmation of the uniqueness of historical events.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Professor Kenneth Charlton, my supervisor, for his unfailing wisdom, interest and guidance; to Professor Hedley Burston, Miss Margaret Bryant and my other colleagues of the History Department of the London University Institute of Education, and to my family, for bearing with such understanding Sir John Pakington's lengthy intrusion into my life; to the late Humphrey Pakington, fifth Baron Hampton and grandson of Sir John, for his many kindnesses in introducing me to the history of his family; to those who have put at my disposal the collections in their care, and particularly to Lord Blake for permission to consult the Derby Papers in his study at the Queen's College, Oxford; to Miss Margaret Henderson and her staff at St Helen's, Worcester, who have typified the helpfulness encountered in record offices and libraries throughout the country; to Fuz who has typed the manuscript with much care; - to these and many others my grateful thanks are due.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One

THE BACKGROUND

This study of Sir John Pakington and his contribution to the development of national education is as much a study of failure as of success. Pakington's Education Bills of 1855 and 1857 did not reach the Statute Book, and though in 1856 he was instrumental in securing an important Act for English education and the union of the rival groups of Manchester educationists, the Newcastle Commission of 1858 of which he was the instigator led not to major educational reform but to the aridity of the Revised Code. Though his criticisms of the conduct of the Education Department led to the resignation of Lowe in 1864 and to the institution of a Select Committee under Pakington's chairmanship in 1865-6, his Draft Report was outmanoeuvred, and the Conservatives, in power 1866-8, in educational matters only flattered to deceive. During the debates on the Elementary Education Bill of 1870, however, Forster acknowledged both Pakington's general contribution to the cause of national education and the specific connection between the Bill of 1857 and his own work. Pakington himself rejoiced that "the Bill contains almost every one of those provisions for which humbly but earnestly, I have laboured for the last 15 or 20 years". (1)

Pakington's contribution to education within Parliament was mainly confined to the years 1854-70, but his work for individual educational institutions and societies spanned some forty years. Schools of every description, denominational, secular, ragged, pauper, public, trade and board, reformatories, schools of art, mechanics' institutes, training colleges, schoolteachers' associations, all excited his interest and benefited from his concern.

---

(1) Hansard, CCIII, 755, 22 July 1870.

Moreover Pakington developed his own concept of national education, a national education which, while allowing free rein to denominational and private school, envisaged also the provision of good-quality, free, rate-supported education throughout the country.

Pakington's commitment to education has as yet received little attention. Neither the 102 line obituary in The Times, nor the leading article upon him in the same edition (1) made any mention of his work for education. Only sixteen of the 200 line entry on Pakington in the Dictionary of National Biography are devoted to educational matters, and even in his own lifetime Pakington had cause to complain of the failure to record his work for education. Thus in 1860 he wrote to Messrs. Griffin and Co. in correction of the proposed entry in their Contemporary Biography, "... some mention should also be made of the exertions of Sir J. both in and out of Parlt. in the cause of National Education". (2)

The remainder of this background chapter will be devoted to a very brief preliminary survey of Pakington's personal and political life, (3) but only insofar as they are immediately relevant to an understanding of his work

---

(1) The Times, 10 April 1880. The Worcester Herald, 17 April 1880, was more discerning. "His abilities were most prominent in connection with the subject of National Education in which he always evinced the deepest interest and displayed the greatest tolerance."

(2) B.L. Add. Mss. 28511, 246, 248. The covering letter is dated 26 March 1860.

(3) Materials for a full scale personal and political biography exist, principally in the Hampton and Curtler and Hallmark Mss. These papers are at the St. Helen's Record Office Worcester, now part of the Hereford and Worcester Record Office, (cited hereafter as W.R.O.). Peter Gordon called attention to the Hampton Mss. in his article 'Some Sources for the History of the School Manager, 1800-1902', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (3), 1973, and made some use of them in his book The Victorian School Manager. A Study in the Management of Education, 1800-1902 (1974), 90-7.

for national education. This format is particularly necessary for the earlier period for, although Pakington was born in the eighteenth century, entered Parliament in 1837, and remained a member of it until his death in 1880, his work for national education at Westminster was contained almost entirely within the years 1854-70.

Born John Somerset Russell on 20 February 1799, Pakington was educated at Eton and Oriel where he matriculated but did not graduate. He was not renowned for study, (1) and later came to regret his failure to make the most of his educational opportunities. (2) Political advancement did something to repair the damage in 1853, however, when Derby as Chancellor of the University included both Pakington and Disraeli in his list of honorary D.C.L. (3) As a young man Pakington saw himself as a Regency buck, he was nicknamed 'Mr. Brummell' and in 1827 achieved notoriety as the last man to fight a duel in Worcestershire. Pakington always retained his stylish youthful image. Malmesbury in 1858 recorded, "He is a very young man of his age, both in activity and appearance. A slight figure he is generally to be seen on horseback, and always with spurs and dapperly dressed." (4) Though slight

---

(1) See for example, Curtler and Hallmark Mss. W.R.O. 705.380. B.A. 2309/18/(1), a letter from his elder brother William Herbert Russell from Genoa, 9 February 1819, and another dated 26 January 1820 from John Russell to his uncle, Sir John Pakington, rejecting the charge of being a "frivolous dancing, libertine".

(2) Particularly in January 1854 when he was asked to represent Oxford University in Parliament. Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/11/(iv)/1. Pakington to Johnny his elder son, 17 January 1854.

(3) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 14 May 1853. The degree was conferred on 7 June 1853.

(4) Malmesbury, Memoirs of an ex-Minister (2 vols., 1884), II, 127.

Pakington was strong, and Disraeli likened him to a "little wiry man". (1)

Pakington was an attractive human being, "so woefully extravagant, highly emotional, tender hearted, and with a certain idealism." (2) Yet his family life was clouded with tragedy. His first wife Mary died in 1843 after twenty years of marriage, leaving him with one son, Johnny. (3) Pakington then fell passionately in love with Augusta Murray, (4) daughter of the Bishop of Rochester, but their idyllic marriage which took place in June 1844 was soon cut short. An infant daughter died at birth, and in 1848 Augusta herself died in giving birth to Herby, (5) Pakington's second son. In 1851 Pakington was married for a third time, to Augusta Davies, widow of a former Worcestershire M.P. Though his third wife survived him, Johnny's health was a continuing matter for concern, and shortly before Pakington himself died in 1880 he found it necessary to have Johnny declared of unsound mind and made a ward of Chancery.

Pakington's domestic life was, however, relatively settled during the period of his major interest in education, and it would be wrong to conclude that in a specific sense the demands of his family unduly interfered with his work for education. Indeed one incident from 1842 shows how domestic affliction probably prevented Pakington from becoming so involved in a colonial career as to have been unable to work for national education in England. In

---

(1) Zetland (ed.), The Letters of Disraeli to Lady Bradford and Lady Chesterfield (2 vols., 1929), II, 302.
(2) Letter of Pakington's grandson, Humphrey Arthur Pakington, fifth Baron Hampton (1888-1974), to R.E. Aldrich, 13 September 1970.
(3) John Slaney Pakington, second Baron Hampton (1826-1893).
(4) Details of the courtship are contained in Pakington's diaries for 1843 and 1844. Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(i)/2, 3.
(5) Herbert Perrot Pakington, third Baron Hampton (1848-1906).

November of that year Stanley wrote to Pakington offering him a major colonial post. (1) Pakington immediately declined to accept, for Mary his first wife was close to death, but though Stanley was prepared to keep the post open Peel disagreed. (2) The offer was withdrawn and Pakington remained an M.P. at Westminster.

Though Pakington was a family man, he was also, as his diaries show, very much a ladies' man, and it is perhaps fitting that the last entry in his diary, that for 23 March 1880, should read "took Lady E. Bryan to dinner". (3) But Pakington was also, unlike Disraeli, a man's man. Fit and active until the end of his life he was a countryman and a sportsman. In his twenties he devoted himself wholeheartedly to the pursuits of a country gentleman. He was an inveterate massacrer of game on his own and other estates. Sailing, fishing, skating and archery were other outdoor pursuits, whilst chess and billiards were indoor games in which he excelled. Pakington played to win, wagers were frequent and disputes not unknown. (4)

Social life was enjoyed with as much energy as his sporting activities. At Westwood Park (5) and Eaton Square (6) he entertained the great figures of the day. He was an

---

(1) Probably the governorship of Van Diemen's Land. H. and R. Pakington, The Pakingtons of Westwood (1975), 125.
(2) Derby Mss. Box 141/9. The endorsements of Stanley and Peel are added to Pakington's letter to Stanley of 28 November 1842. There was a second offer in 1845, Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Stanley, 7 June 1845.
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/56, Diary, 20 March 1880.
(4) As in October 1851 when there were arguments with Lord Camden over games of chess. Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/6, Diary, October 1851.
(5) The family seat in Worcestershire since the days of Henry VIII. Rebuilt in the seventeenth century the mansion was situated in an extensive park with a sixty acre lake.
(6) His London houses were, from 1844, 55 Eaton Place; 1847, 41 Eaton Square; and from 1869, 9 Eaton Square.

inveterate party- and theatre-goer and had a particular passion for music. He pursued this relentless course till the end. For example a diary entry for May 1879 when he was eighty years young saw him begin the day at Westwood Park; "Busy all morning with Simons' wood and estate accounts. At 1.40 left for London. I dined at Sir Jas. Bailey's. Went with Eleanor to parties at Lady Northcote and Admiralty." (1) He spent the next day at the Office and gave a dinner party in the evening.

In many ways Pakington restored the fortunes of his family. He assumed his mother's surname in 1831 after the death of his maternal uncle, and in 1846 after much effort secured the revival of the baronetcy. In 1874 he was raised to the peerage as Baron Hampton. But in a purely financial sense Pakington's extravagance and miscalculations left a legacy from which the family never recovered. Westwood Park was never again occupied by a Pakington, and in 1900 the estate and mansion were finally sold. Pakington's financial difficulties affected his political career, and were a major factor in inducing him in 1875 to accept Disraeli's offer of the post of First Civil Service Commissioner, with a salary of £2,000 p.a. (2)

This sketch of Pakington the man is intended to show that Pakington was too much of a man ever to be, or to be thought of merely as an educational reformer. When contemporaries thought of Pakington they thought of Pakington the dandy, Pakington the socialite, Pakington the sportsman, Pakington the spendthrift, Pakington the

---

(1) William Simons was the park keeper, Henry Simons the head gamekeeper. Eleanor Pratt was a frequent visitor. Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/55, Diary, 21 May 1879.

(2) He wrote ruefully to Disraeli on the occasion of the Brydges Willyams' bequest "I wish some old lady would admire me!" Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/73, Pakington to Disraeli, 15 January 1864.

romantic. Pakington was a character, a man whose powerful enthusiasm and energy was rarely, except when in Ministerial office, concentrated upon one theme, but diffused, even dissipated at times over a whole range of activities. He was in short, a man for all seasons.

Though Pakington was by most standards a successful politician with a parliamentary career which spanned over forty years, he was never entirely at home in a political party. And though he always retained some of the attitudes of the typical 'country gentleman' M.P., and was naturally inclined to the Conservative side, he might well have achieved more for education as a Whig or Liberal, or even as a genuine Radical or Independent. (1) Again, had he entered Parliament earlier and secured a post in Peel's government of 1841-6 education might have been benefited. (2) As it was he was unsuccessful in 1832, 1833 and 1835, and not until 1837 did Pakington enter Parliament as Conservative member for Droitwich, the borough which he represented until 1874. (3) Before 1846 Pakington was

---

(1) The Worcestershire Chronicle, 17 April 1880, described Pakington as "a consistent but Liberal Tory throughout his Parliamentary career ...." Gillian Sutherland in Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century (1971), 27, characterizes Pakington as "the eccentric Tory radical". For the Radicals see W. Harris, The History of the Radical Party in Parliament (1885), and S. Maccoby, English Radicalism 1832-1852 (1935), and English Radicalism 1853-1886 (1938). Attitudes to education are examined in R.E. Aldrich, 'Radicalism, National Education and the Grant of 1833', Journal of Educational Administration and History, V (1), 1973, and H. Silver, English Education and the Radicals 1780-1850 (1975).

(2) He wrote to Peel in 1845 asking for office, but Peel in refusing advised that those who had entered Parliament 1832-5 had prior claim. Peel Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 40559, 158-60, Pakington to Peel, 7 February and 161-2, Peel to Pakington, 24 February 1845.

(3) In that time there were only two contested elections. In 1868 Pakington defeated the Liberal, John Corbett by 790 votes to 603, but in 1874 was himself defeated by Corbett, 787 votes to 401.

reckoned as a Conservative with an independent turn of mind, after 1846 he was a curious political creature, an independent Peelite who had voted for protection. In 1851 Pakington at last "wrote to Lord Stanley to tell him that I should join his party." (1)

By 1853 Pakington was Disraeli's rival for the leadership of the Conservative party in the House of Commons. Derby's government of 1852 had been defeated upon the issue of Disraeli's budget, and the Chancellor's incompetence, and petulance, in defeat, created unrest within the party. Charles Greville noted early in 1853, "It does not look as if the connection between Disraeli and the party could go on long. Their dread and distrust of him and his contempt of them render it difficult if not impossible. Pakington is already talked of as their leader." (2) A fortnight later Henry Greville recorded "Pakington is evidently bidding for the lead of the party in case of a fall-out with Disraeli, who is said to be very jealous of Pakington, and for whom he shows a great contempt." (3) Had Pakington achieved the leadership in the Commons in 1853, and ultimately the leadership of the party and the premiership in 1868, an education measure might certainly have come earlier, at least in 1868 rather than in 1870. As it was the considerable mutual antagonism between Pakington and Disraeli which always underlay the official relationship of two men who sat and acted together in Commons and Lords for over forty

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/6, Diary, 11 March 1851.
(2) P.W. Wilson, The Greville Diary (2 vols., 1927), II, 404, 20 February 1853.
(3) Viscountess Enfield (ed.), Leaves from the Diary of Henry Greville (2 vols., 1883-4), II, 45, 5 March 1853.

years, probably hindered the educational cause. Pakington in 1853 declared Disraeli "to be deficient in the essential qualifications for a party leader - he lacks steady principle, tact, discretion and courtesy,"[1] whilst Disraeli's disparagement of Pakington began in 1838[2] and lasted till his death.[3]

Pakington's closest political allegiance was to Peel, a man whose devotion to duty he much admired, and to whom he felt particularly indebted for the revival of the baronetcy. The record of Peel's second government in education,[4] moreover, suggests that had Peel been as good a horseman as Pakington the cause of education might have prospered, with Peel and Pakington acting in concert. Pakington's loyalty to Peel was eventually transferred to Derby.[5] Though his personal respect for his new leader rarely wavered, Pakington could never successfully appeal to the social reformer in Derby, as he might have done with Peel, to secure official Conservative backing for his educational schemes. Pakington's inability to secure that backing, however, rested on matters of principle rather than of personality. On the issue of rate-aided education he was at variance with the great majority of the Conservative party for some twenty years. Even close colleagues like Walpole and Ashley greeted his views on this matter with regret, others like Henley opposed him

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/2/(vi)/M/P/37, Copy of Pakington to Walpole, 2 December 1853.

(2) R. Disraeli (ed.), Lord Beaconsfield's Letters, 1830-52 (1887), 128-9. Disraeli to Sarah Disraeli, 23 January 1838, on the occasion of Pakington's maiden speech, which was certainly more successful than Disraeli's own.

(3) Disraeli never relented. "It was anticipated that Lord Beaconsfield would attend the funeral but his lordship did not do so." The Worcestershire Advertiser, 17 April 1880.

(4) See R.E. Aldrich, 'Education and the Political Parties, 1830-1870', London University M.Phil. thesis, 1970, Ch. V.

(5) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 11 March 1851.

most bitterly. Indeed Pakington's educational commitment was a major obstacle to his continued membership of the Conservative party, and in 1871 he commented that where his work for education had involved him in party differences "it has been not with my political opponents, but rather with the friends with whom I have usually acted in public life." (1)

Though Pakington was in educational matters a rebel and a nuisance from a party viewpoint, he had a role to play which caused Derby and Disraeli to refuse his offers of resignation and retain his services as a front bench spokesman. Had this not been so, had he become separated from the party in the 1850's he might as an independent member have devoted himself more wholeheartedly to education within the Commons, or even after 1859 have become a member of a Liberal ministry with the opportunity of helping to frame a government education bill. But Pakington's successes as a Cabinet minister made him for some twenty years after 1852 an essential Conservative party asset. Though Disraeli stated that Pakington's appointment as Colonial Secretary in that year was a

---

(1) Pakington's presidential address to the Annual Congress of the N.A.P.S.S. at Leeds, The Times, 5 October 1871. Printed in Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Leeds Meeting 1871 (1872), 1-21. The Times, with its "unrivalled news service" (A. Aspinall, Politics and the Press, c. 1780-1850 (1949), 313), and its role as the "monument to the fundamental unity of educated opinion" (J.R. Vincent, The Formation of the Liberal Party, 1857-1868 (1966), 60), brought Pakington's major extra-Parliamentary speeches on education accurately and speedily to public notice. On the one occasion when Pakington was dissatisfied with a Times report, of a speech he had made at Birmingham to the National Society jubilee meeting, he wrote to the editor, "Your reporters are generally so accurate that I presume the report to which I refer must have been copied from some local paper." The Times, 4 November 1861.

matter of mere chance, the story lacks credibility. (1) For by 1852 Pakington was an acknowledged expert on colonial matters. Pakington had visited the New World, (2) his first Commons speech (3) was on a colonial issue, he had acted with Stanley in 1842 on the Select Committee of Inquiry into the West India Colonies, and had himself drafted the Committee's resolutions. (4) He had received offers of major colonial appointments in the 1840's and had played a leading part in the colonial sugar issue at the end of the decade. (5)

Nevertheless, though Pakington was in many ways well equipped to become Colonial Secretary in 1852 this was a major turning point in his career. For he had also by this time some record in domestic legislation, and had he become, as Disraeli intimated, Under-Secretary to Walpole at the Home Office, though his overall political career might well have been less successful, he might never have attained Cabinet rank, he might possibly have become a candidate for the office of Vice-President of the Council in 1858 or 1866.

---

(1) It is repeated uncritically in W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (2 vol. ed., 1929) I, 1160-1, and R. Blake, Disraeli (1966), 313. Disraeli's memorandum was written in the 1860's. Derby knew Pakington well, though Malmesbury's suggestion that Pakington would have received Cabinet office in 1851, Malmesbury, Memoirs of an ex-Minister (1884), I, 278, 28 February 1851 is also incorrect. Pakington was in Italy at the time of the February discussions. See Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/6, Diary, 4 March 1851.

(2) In 1833, with his wife and son, he toured the U.S.A. and Canada.

(3) Hansard, XL, 346-52, 22 January 1838.

(4) P.P. 1842, xiii, 1, See also I.M. Cumpston, Indians Overseas in British Territories, 1834-54 (1953), 71-3.

(5) See P.P. 1847-8, xxiii, 1, The Select Committee Report, and B. Disraeli, Lord George Bentinck: a political biography (1852), 529-50. Pakington's major speeches on the sugar issue are to be found in Hansard, XCIX, 825-43, 19 June 1848, and CXI, 567-73, 31 May 1850.

As Colonial Secretary Pakington was an undoubted success, [1] as his challenge for the Commons' leadership in 1853 clearly shows. He acquired a reputation as the statesman who ended general transportation to Australia, [2] and achieved significant reforms in New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria. The New Zealand Government Act, "the most liberal colonial measure since the American Revolution," [3] has given him a permanent place in the history of those islands. [4] The Colonial Secretaryship, one of the "hardest worked of places", [5] left Pakington little time for educational concerns in 1852 itself. Subsequently his position as an official Conservative spokesman in colonial and military matters was strengthened by his appointment to the Sebastopol Committee, and as an ex-Cabinet minister he felt keenly his responsibilities to the nation, to the party and to Parliament in such crises as the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny.

---

(1) See for example C.G.F. Greville, The Greville Memoirs (8 vols., 1888), VI, 465, 7 July 1852, "The appointment ... of Sir John Pakington, has turned out ... one of the best"; and W.D. Jones, The American Problem in British Diplomacy, 1841-61 (1974), 109, who characterizes Pakington as "the able efficient Colonial Secretary".

(2) The last convict ship to Van Diemen's Land set sail on 31 December 1852. Pakington's despatch to Sir William Denison, the Lieutenant Governor, dated 14 December 1852, is reprinted in K.N. Bell and W.P. Morrell, Select Documents on British Colonial Policy, 1830-1860 (1928), 319-20.

(3) W.P. Morrell, British Colonial Policy in the age of Peel and Russell (1966), 336. See also W.P. Morrell, British Colonial Policy in the Mid-Victorian Age (1969).

(4) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/16/(xi)/13, is a letter from a Committee in Christchurch dated 20 December 1852, together with a copy of the Lyttelton Times of 25 December 1852, expressing the gratitude of the people of New Zealand. Other important references to Pakington's work as Colonial Secretary are to be found in C.E. Carrington, The British Overseas (1950), H.E. Egerton, A Short History of British Colonial Policy (17th edition, 1950), O.O.G.M. MacDonagh, A pattern of Government growth, 1800-1860 (1961) and A.F. Pollard, The British Empire (1909).

(5) His entries in Hansard, CXXII, for example, exceeded one hundred.

In Derby's government of 1858-9 Pakington became First Lord of the Admiralty, a post for which he was well fitted by both experience and temperament. Even The Times approved, (1) and as naval historians (2) have recognized, Pakington's period of office marked a most significant era in the development of the British navy. Pakington played the most important part in the inception of Britain's iron-clad fleet, and fittingly he was personally invited to launch the Warrior on 29 December 1860. (3) Unfortunately Pakington's tenure of the Admiralty was marked by two prolonged disputes with Disraeli over the issues of expenditure and appointments to the Board of Admiralty. (4) For a second time Cabinet office had weakened rather than strengthened Pakington's concern for education. Moreover during the years 1858-9 there developed more fully Pakington's relationship with the Queen (5) and Prince Consort. When in 1866 Pakington returned to the Admiralty it was largely the Queen's influence which, on the Cabinet re-shuffle necessitated in 1867 by the resignations of

---

(1) The Times, 26 February 1858.
(2) See for example, G.E. Fox, British Admirals and Chinese Pirates 1832-1869 (1940), and M.A. Lewis, The Navy in Transition 1814-1864 (1965).
(3) For a contemporary tribute to Pakington's work for the navy see J. Scott Russell, The Fleet of the Future in 1862; or, England without a Fleet (1862). Scott Russell was a distinguished marine engineer.
(4) R. Blake, Disraeli (1966) admits that Pakington was in the right in both these issues. The more serious dispute over appointments which almost destroyed the Derby Cabinet can be followed in the Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/43-5. See also R. Blake, Disraeli (1966), 388-95, and W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1929), I, 1655-8.
(5) "Good old Sir John Pakington" she recorded in 1874 on the occasion of his elevation to the peerage. G.E. Buckle (ed.), The Letters of Queen Victoria, 1862-1885 (3 vols., 1926-8), II, 322.

Carnarvon, Cranborne and Peel over the Reform issue, saw Pakington installed at the War Office. Here, characteristically, he began to grapple with the problems of military education, commission purchase, flogging, promotion and departmental reorganization, but time was short and final settlement of the major issues was left to his successor, Cardwell. (1)

The three Cabinet posts which Pakington held determined that his chief responsibilities to the Queen, the country, Parliament and to the Conservative party, whether in office or in opposition, would be in foreign, colonial, military and naval matters. These areas of concern suited both Pakington's temperament and natural inclinations. He was an inveterate traveller, a keen sailor, (2) and a lover of ceremonial and the grand occasions. (3) Pakington was Colonial Secretary before he began his parliamentary work for national education, and First Lord and Secretary for War when the majority of that work was completed. The nearest Pakington came to occupying a post which would have given him responsibility

---

(1) Curtler and Hallmark Mss. W.R.O. 705.380. B.A. 2309/65, Pakington's candidate book and letter book as Secretary of State for War, and Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 5117/2/(ix), a copy of the twenty-seven page memorandum left by Pakington for his successor, dated December 1868, are useful sources for this period. Pakington's work at the War Office is considered in some detail in Sir R. Biddulph, Lord Cardwell at the War Office (1904). See also Alan R. Skelley, 'The Tragedy of British Military Education: The Cardwell Reforms, 1868-74', Journal of Educational Administration and History, III (2), 1971.

(2) In 1830, for example, he bought the yacht Liberty for £600 and many summers were devoted to south coast sailing. Torquay and Cowes were favourite haunts. Curtler and Hallmark Mss. W.R.O. 705.380. B.A. 2309/54/(x), Diary, 12 January 1830.

(3) Malmesbury in describing the royal visit to Cherbourg in 1858 comments that Pakington wished to turn "a great national ceremony into a Worcestershire picnic." Malmesbury, Memoirs of an ex-Minister (1884), II, 126.

within the Cabinet for matters of domestic reform was in February 1859 when Derby broached a Cabinet reshuffle whereby Pakington would have become Home Secretary and "acting, in fact, as the right hand man of the House of Commons leader ...." (1)

Pakington's membership of the Derby and Disraeli Cabinets increased his personal and political confidence and prestige, and thus indirectly enhanced all his work for national education. But on the other hand Pakington's responsibilities as a Cabinet minister and Privy Councillor gave him a concern for colonial, naval and military matters which had a more truly "national" dimension, a "national" claim upon his services, both in and out of office, which even his commitment to national education could not always match. And those who have sought to sum up Pakington's distinctive contribution to the history of this country have rightly and understandably concentrated upon his achievements as a successful reforming Colonial Secretary and First Lord of the Admiralty. Indeed Pakington's very successes as a Cabinet minister on balance not only reduced his parliamentary work for education, but also have been a major factor in accounting for the neglect of this work by contemporaries and historians alike.

Pakington's work for education must also be examined against the background of his general concern for social

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/11/(111)/45. Derby to Pakington, 14 February 1859. Derby and Disraeli both approved the change, but Chandos refused to join the Cabinet and the scheme was dropped.

reform. He had no new philosophy for changing society as such, but he was prepared, in true Conservative fashion, to devote his considerable energies to the removal of proven abuses. For twenty-four years he conscientiously occupied the position of Chairman of Worcestershire Quarter Sessions, and in his capacity as a magistrate gained a sound knowledge of many of the basic problems of society.[1] The Education Bills of 1855 and 1857 can be seen as a logical development of his several earlier private bills for reform, four of which reached the Statute Book. These were, in 1840 an Act to amend the sale of beer, in 1844 an Act to amend the law respecting the office of county coroner, in 1847 an Act to amend procedures for the trial and punishment of juvenile offenders, and in 1850 a Larceny Summary Jurisdiction Act. These were not major measures, they were conservative rather than radical in temper, and they aroused hostility in some parliamentary Radicals[2] who, as a consequence, were later suspicious of Pakington's attempts to solve the education question. Pakington was trying to provide answers to problems of crime, disorder, poverty and immorality, answers which he would later come to see as being ineffective without the complement of national education. Prisons, police, poor law, vaccination and the property rights of married women were other social causes in which Pakington showed considerable interest. His concern for the health and efficiency of the armed services also led him to feature prominently in the saga of the Contagious Diseases legislation. Pakington was a strong supporter of these

---

(1) Curtler and Hallmark Mss. W.R.O. 705.380. B.A.2309/17/(1), Diary, 3 April 1826, "Attended sessions, and qualified to act as a magistrate". This was the first step in Pakington's public career.
(2) For example, Joseph Hume.

Acts, and headed a minority report of seven in the proceedings of the Royal Commission which inquired into their working.(1) Pakington did, however, play a part in securing the raising of the age of female consent.(2) His equal concern for sailors when on board ship, and indeed for all travellers at sea, made him, as befitted an Elder Brother of Trinity House and the President for twenty-one years of the Institute of Naval Architects, a major parliamentary campaigner in the 1860's and 70's for legislation to ensure safety at sea. (3)

In all these issues Pakington was acting basically as an individual. He sought, and failed, to convince the Conservative party of the need to adopt a more definite and planned policy which would have included specific proposals on domestic issues. In part this was a reaction against Derby's and Disraeli's styles of leadership, or lack of it. Pakington was an organizer, a planner, where necessary a man of detail, rather than a scholar dilettante or a poseur and opportunist. He urged on Disraeli in 1853, that "more pre-concert, better pre-arrangement, and a further mutual understanding than existed amongst us last session are essential to our action as a party."(4) Pakington wanted a smaller inner

---

(1) The Acts dated from 1864. P.P. 1871, xix, 1, is the Royal Commission Report. See also the Reports of two Select Committees on which Pakington served; P.P. 1866, xi, 523 and P.P. 1868-9, vii, 1. Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705. 349. B.A. 3835/16/(xi)/57-63, is a collection of letters which relate to Pakington's stand in defeating the Contagious Diseases Acts (1866-9) Repeal Bill of 1873.

(2) He moved the second reading of the Offences against the Person Bill in the Lords. Hansard, CCXXIV, 1518, 8 June 1875.

(3) See for example his major speech on the loss of the London, Hansard, CLXXXII, 524-37, 19 March 1866. He seconded Plimsoll's motion of March 1873 for a Royal Commission, and strongly supported the Merchant Shipping Survey Bill of 1871 and the Unseaworthy Ships Bill of 1875.

(4) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/10, Pakington to Disraeli, 30 November 1853.

'Shadow Cabinet' to keep important issues under constant review.(1) Whether such pre-concert would have favoured education specifically is difficult to determine. Certainly it might have strengthened Conservatives' resolves on an Education Act 1866-8, and have enabled them to avoid the "gyrations" over Parliamentary Reform which occurred in 1867.(2)

Matters came to a head in 1871-2 with the New Social Movement and the Burghley discussions, events in which Pakington played a leading part, and events which prompted Disraeli's reassertion of his authority over the party with speeches at Manchester and Crystal Palace in 1872. Pakington's initiative in the New Social Movement, an initiative which called amongst other things for more technical education, for "healthy homes at fair rents", and "wholesome food at fair cost", an initiative which prompted him to organize a 'Council of Legislation' and to collaborate with the 'Council of Workingmen', is the high water mark of his own career as a social reformer.(3)

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/16, Pakington to Disraeli, 4 December 1854. See also Joliffe to Disraeli, 27 December 1856, quoted in W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1929), I, 1459.

(2) Typically Pakington had urged on Derby and Disraeli early in December 1866 the need to prepare a draft Reform Bill and had sent them both "a rough outline". Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/82a, Pakington to Derby, 2 December 1866, and B/XX/P/82, Pakington to Disraeli, 4 December 1866. See R. Blake, Disraeli (1966), 461, for a summary of Disraeli's "gyrations" on this issue. Pakington himself,much to Disraeli's fury, was responsible for the term the 'Ten Minutes Bill'.

(3) There is still some confusion about the New Social Movement. P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 150, n.1, states that there are inaccuracies in the accounts given in G.J. Holyoake, Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life (2 vols., 1892), and W.H.G. Armytage, A.J. Mundella, 1825-1897 (1951). Armytage, 99-100 includes some useful quotations, however, which show Pakington's leadership in this matter.

Pakington's participation in February 1872 in the Burghley discussions and his commitment there to overthrowing Disraeli in favour of Derby was partly occasioned by his dissatisfaction with Disraeli's attitude to social reform. Two years later, as Paul Smith has commented, "The great Conservative champion of social reform and the reconciliation of classes came into office in 1874 without a single concrete proposal in his head." (1)

Though sadly there was no place for Pakington in the reforming ministry 1874-80, (2) when men such as Cross, Sandon and Sclater-Booth led the social policy of the Conservative party in office, Pakington had 'led' Conservative thought in education, and in other social matters during the long years of disappointment which followed 1846. He was a genuine link between 'Peelite' reform and the ministry of 1874-80, (3) and his most considerable and immediate achievement had been in preparing the Conservative party to support the Education Bill of 1870.

The promotion of national education was therefore but one, and not necessarily the most important, episode, in Pakington's career. It must be studied against a variety of backgrounds, and in particular, as this chapter has suggested, the peculiarities and responsibilities of Pakington the man, the politician, the Cabinet minister,

---

(1) P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 199.

(2) Defeated at Droitwich, Pakington had been consoled, on his 75th birthday, with a peerage.

(3) P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 29, maintains that "Peel's Liberal-Conservatism, drawing in the bourgeoisie, not Disraeli's faded popular Toryism" was the basis for Conservative adaptation to social reform.

the social reformer must be kept in mind. But Pakington's energy and determination were such that, in spite of these other commitments, and though he was well past fifty years of age when he took up the cause seriously in Parliament, he is a major figure in the history of education. Although any study of his concept of, and work for, national education will be concerned with failure as much as with success, an appreciation of the man and of his unique contribution, which crossed political, social and religious boundaries in its search for a truly national basis for education, is essential to an understanding of the achievement of elementary education for all in the nineteenth century.

Chapter Two

AN EDUCATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP

In the first sixteen years of his Commons' career Pakington made only one specific speech upon education,[1] and the greater part of that consisted of reading a letter which had been written to him some four years previously.[2] His first mention of education, however, occurred early enough, during a spirited attack on the Melbourne government in 1840, when Pakington asked, "Was the Government steady in its policy in any respect - had it been steady in the administration of the laws - had it been steady in its measures with regard to Jamaica - had it been steady as regarded Canada - had it been steady in its educational scheme, or in any other of its measures?"[3] When Pakington became a parliamentary champion of education in the 1850's, however, he could base his speeches upon knowledge and experience gained from three major sources: the role of education in preventing crime, the role of the Church of England in promoting education, and the examples of individual schools, colleges and societies with which he was personally connected.

One of the chief arguments of promoters of elementary education in the first half of the nineteenth century was its value in reducing the incidence of crime. In 1847, when moving for leave to introduce his Bill for the more speedy trial and punishment of juvenile offenders, Pakington stated that in his view the peculiar characteristic

---

(1) Hansard, XCI, 1167-71, 22 April 1847.
(2) Reverend James Prince Lee to Pakington, 11 April 1843.
(3) Hansard, LI, 760, 20 January 1840.

of the criminals of the country was their "frightful state of ignorance of every duty towards God and man". He emphasized his "strong opinion upon the subject - an opinion which he had formed from his experience in courts of justice - that the want of a better education in this country was one of the most fruitful sources of crime, and that some extensive system of education throughout the country would be found to be a great means of its diminution." (1)

Pakington saw education as a means of preventing juvenile crime. But his more particular concerns in 1847 were to improve the methods of trial and conviction, and to ensure that while proper punishment was inflicted "the great object of the reformation of the offender" should always be kept in mind. This principle he considered applicable to prisoners of all ages, and though he had serious doubts about some elements of the separate system, he considered it to be the most beneficial yet devised. In 1849 in a debate on prison discipline in which he deplored the want of a proper prison system Pakington reaffirmed his view "that all who were open to temptation ought to be instructed and disciplined in habits of self reliance, and that prisoners sent forth from confinement ought, if possible, to be qualified for a new intercourse with the world." (2) Industrial and moral training, in combination with adequate punishment was Pakington's basic formula. Throughout his public life he took a keen interest in reformatory schools.

Pakington was one of the principal speakers at the large gathering, presided over by the Bishop of the diocese, held in the Crown Court of the New Shire Hall in Worcester on 6 April 1839, when resolutions were moved pledging the

---

(1) Hansard, XC, 431, 23 February 1847.
(2) Hansard, CVI, 1018, 27 June 1849.

meeting to establish a Diocesan Board of Education in connection with the National School Society. (1) One of the particular objects was to establish a training school for teachers, and several handsome donations were made on the spot. (2) Progress was slow, however, and at a public meeting at the Guildhall, Worcester, held on 20 April 1843 it was found impossible, owing to shortage of funds, to establish a training college as such. As a temporary measure it was agreed that six exhibitions of £15 p.a. should be given to maintain pupils at the Worcester Diocesan school under the tutelage of the Reverend George Elton. Pakington moved one of the major resolutions at this meeting, made a long speech, (3) and supplied evidence for the Board's annual report. As Chairman of the Quarter Sessions he stated "from the calendars in his possession, that of 1,954 persons committed for the years 1835 to 1841, both inclusive, no less than 771 persons could neither read nor write - that is about two-fifths of the whole; and taking the last six years, the number of prisoners who could read and write well were but 23." (4) In the years 1839-45 the grants to schools from the Worcester Diocesan Board totalled £1975 0. 6d.

---

(1) T.C. Turberville, Worcestershire in the Nineteenth Century (1852), 78.

(2) Pakington gave £25 and made a second donation of £10 in 1843. His annual subscription to the Diocesan Society, of which he was a Vice-President, was five guineas, and he was a two guinea subscriber to the National Society.

(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/2, Diary, 20 April 1843.

(4) National Society Record Office (hereafter N.S.R.O.), Report of the Worcester Diocesan Board of Eduention, 20 April 1843. It could be argued, however, that the more educated were less liable to be apprehended and convicted.

Though Pakington maintained that a sound religious education according to the principles of the Church of England was the best remedy which could be devised to relieve the moral and spiritual destitution which afflicted great numbers of the population, he nevertheless gave encouragement to other types of educational institution. Thus in January 1844 (1) he received a deputation from Droitwich concerned about the promotion of a Mechanics' Institute, and on 8 April 1846 he dined at Droitwich and "attended Mechanics Institute at 8 p.m.". (2)

A month later Pakington attended the annual meeting, held at noon on 27 May in the Central School Rooms at Westminster, of the National Society. The gathering included many friends of education, Milman and Whewell, Sandon and Cowper, Kay-Shuttleworth and Tremenheere. The children were examined, and their proficiency in music, under the direction of the renowned Mr Hullah, was particularly remarked upon by Pakington whose own musical

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/3, Diary, 27 January 1844.

(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/4, Diary, 12 April 1846. For an examination of Mechanics' Institutes in Worcestershire see C.M. Turner, 'Mechanics' Institutes in Warwickshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire 1820-1890: a Regional Survey', Leicester University M.Ed. thesis, 1966. Turner draws upon some of this material in 'Sociological Approaches to the History of Education', British Journal of Educational Studies, XVII(2), 1969, an article which, after commending Talcott Parsons' action frame of reference, concludes by calling historians of education to "explorations in the use of the tools of the sociologist". This theme has been developed in P.W. Musgrave (ed.), Sociology, History and Education (1970); R. Szreter, 'History and the Sociological Perspective in Educational Studies', University of Birmingham Historical Journal, XII, 1969-70; and C.M. Turner, 'Systems Theory and Social Causation in the History of Education', Education for Teaching, LXXXVI, 1971. See also, as a good example of the sociological approach, N.J. Smelser, Social Change in the Industrial Revolution (1959).

interests included the promotion of "congregational psalmody". Pakington's resolution, seconded by Cowper, "That this meeting regards with much satisfaction the progress made by diocesan and district boards throughout the kingdom in the establishment of training schools" was carried unanimously. (1)

In September of 1846 Pakington attended the opening of a new school for Doddeswhile parish, (2) and in March 1847 walked with Ashley to inspect a Ragged School in the capital. (3) In April he spoke in support of the Russell government in the debate on the Education grant, and brought forward the example of King Edward's School, Birmingham. (4) Pakington gave fulsome praise to the Government both for their educational scheme and for the manner in which they had presented it, but though he spoke "as an attached member of the Church of England, and as a member of the National Society", his object in adducing the example of Birmingham was to draw attention to the plight of Dissenters. In areas where Dissenting numbers were limited they would be unable directly to participate in the grants, and yet would usually be excluded from the Church of England schools. Pakington, in this his first Commons speech specifically upon education, declared himself to be "deeply impressed with the actual necessities of the country in respect of education, and convinced that

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/4, Diary, 27 May 1846, and The Times, 28 May 1846.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/4, Diary, 30 September 1846.
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/5, Diary, 17 March 1847.
(4) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/5, Diary, 22 April 1847, and Hansard, XCI, 1167-71, 22 April 1847.

the time was come when they must take some steps to meet those necessities."

King Edward's, Birmingham, indeed provided a valuable example. The foundation included seven schools, one classical, one commercial, and five elementary - three for boys and two for girls, a total of some 1,200 children. Of the 1,161 pupils in attendance on a day in March 1843, 363 were not members of the Church of England. These comprised 122 Wesleyans, 107 Independents, 72 Baptists, 30 Socinians, 8 Lady Huntingdon's Chapel, 8 Presbyterians, 6 Swedenborgians, 4 Roman Catholics, 4 Jews, 1 Quaker, and 1 Calvinist. (1) Though the governors were all members of the Church of England and the waiting lists to attend the schools were full, Dissenting support was attracted by the tolerant approach to the religious issue practised within the schools. During compulsory daily prayers no response as such was demanded from the children, religious lessons were placed first on the school day, and children whose parents so requested in writing could send their children to school one hour later on those mornings set aside for religious lessons. It would appear that very few parents in fact availed themselves of this right. The Church catechism was taught in the classical and commercial schools on Sunday, and in the others on Saturday.

Pakington urged the National Society to make similar concessions throughout its schools. He concluded his speech in praising the scheme such as it was, but added "that he had hoped the Government would have attempted to

---

(1) A more thorough analysis of the pupils in terms of denominational allegiance, social position and university admission, was provided by the Headmaster, Reverend E.H. Gifford, in a paper to the Education department of the N.A.P.S.S., Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Birmingham Meeting, 1857 (1858), 130-4. The school was thoroughly investigated by the Taunton Commission. See for example P.P. 1867-8, xxviii (I), 502-17; ibid. (II), 175-310; ibid. (IV), 956-1034. See also, T.W. Hutton, King Edward's School, Birmingham, 1552-1952 (1952).

do more, and that an approach to something like a State system of education would have been made by them."

Pakington's stance on education in 1847 was similar to that of Lansdowne, who, when he first laid a copy of the Minutes of August and December 1846 on the table of the Lords, had regretted that he was unable to introduce "a plan of general and public education," but had urged the importance of the new Minutes which would at least give education "an impetus beyond what it had hitherto received." (1) Though Brougham complained that this was "the imperfect substitute for a measure promised and expected but withheld," (2) it was T.S. Duncombe, the Radical M.P. for Finsbury, who mounted the major challenge to the Government's scheme by his Commons amendment for a Select Committee to inquire into the 1846 Minutes. His supporters included Bright, Hume and Roebuck, though their contributions were far outweighed in a debate which lasted over three evenings, by powerful speeches from, amongst others, Ewart, Graham, Sandon and Macaulay. In the division on 22 April, 372 votes, including that of Pakington, were cast for the Minutes and only 47 for the amendment. Those in the minority included both Voluntaryists and those who saw the Minutes as a totally inadequate substitute for a genuine scheme of national education.

Pakington spoke briefly on the following evening in support of the general principle behind the amendment of Sir William Clay, member for Tower Hamlets, but he declared himself to be against the doctrine of compulsion. (3) Clay had proposed that in schools supported by state aid

---

(1) Hansard, LXXXIX, 859, 862, 5 February 1847.
(2) Ibid., 869.
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/5, Diary, 23 April 1847, and Hansard, XCI, 1293-4, 23 April 1847.

"... the opportunity of participating in all instruction, other than religious, should be afforded to children whose parents may object to the religious doctrines taught in such schools," (1) but the amendment was defeated by 210 votes to 74. Pakington voted with the majority but Clay numbered Brotherton, Brown, Duncombe, Hindley, Hume, Muntz, Roebuck, Villiers and Warburton amongst his supporters. (2)

The Worcester Diocesan Board of Education declared its support for the new Minutes at a special meeting held in the Guildhall, Worcester on 18 February 1847. A memorial was sent to Lord John Russell, which, after praising the new scheme and its assistance to schools and colleges, went on to "venture to suggest whether greater advantage would not result to such institutions, if grants were permitted to be made under less stringent restrictions, to meet local subscriptions or individual benevolence, for their endowment and maintenance ...." (3) Indeed by 1847 the Board had reached a parlous financial situation. The donations having been spent, annual income was only £190, most of which was spent on the six youths training to be teachers. Since the annual meeting of the previous year only three grants to schools had been made.

In August 1847, however, the Bishop of Worcester convened a special meeting at the Chapter House at which it was decided to establish a Training College for the Diocese, to contain between forty and sixty students. Large subscriptions were entered into, and a provisional committee, of which Pakington was a member, was named. Thus in the autumn of 1847 Pakington threw himself whole-

---

(1) Ibid., 1276.
(2) Ibid., 1313-15.
(3) N.S.R.O. Report of the Worcester Diocesan Board of Education, 18 February 1847.

heartedly into this new educational venture. His resolution at the annual meeting of the National Society in the preceding year was probably part of this campaign, and in 1847 itself he attended a series of gatherings on this subject; the original meeting in the Chapter House at Worcester in August, in Birmingham on 7 October at which he "spoke well", at Birmingham again on 21 and 26 October, and on 4 November - a meeting which he himself chaired, and back again to Worcester for committees on 12 and 15 November. (1)

At the Diocesan Board's annual meeting held in the Chapter House on 12 April 1848 an encouraging report was presented. C.B. Adderley, M.P. had offered a site of three acres at Upper Saltley near Birmingham, and donations to the amount of £4,700 and annual subscriptions of £360 had been secured. (2) By the following year when donations had risen to £5,600 and a National Society grant of £800 and an expected Privy Council grant of £2,500 raised the notional total to some £9,000 and the Board was still £2,500 short of its target, there was further exhortation to "increased and self-denying exertions". The institution was originally planned not merely to provide for the training of sixty schoolmasters but also for the education of one hundred boys of the middle class. In October 1850 the first stone was laid. (3)

The general Diocesan Board report for 1852 was particularly depressing however. Only one grant had been given in the previous year, £10 to the infant school at Studley, schoolmasters had refused to join the schoolmasters' association proposed by the Board and it had collapsed.

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/5, Diary, 1847.

(2) N.S.R.O. Report of the Worcester Diocesan Board of Education, 12 April 1848.

(3) For the history of St. Peter's College, Saltley, see C.S. Allatt, 'The history of St. Peter's College Saltley from 1850-1950, with particular reference to the syllabus', Birmingham University Diploma of Education thesis, 1970; and J. Osborne (ed.), Saltley College Centenary 1850-1950 (1950). The early history of the College is being researched by Ronald Davis for a London University M.Phil. thesis.

John Flint from Herefordshire had been engaged as an organizing master to tour the schools, but to 180 letters sent to the clergy offering his services only thirty-four replies had been received, with only fourteen of these in the affirmative. Though the Saltley Training School had opened on 14 April there had as yet been no response to the advertisements in local papers inviting candidates for exhibitions. (1) Later in the year, on 14 September, when Moseley inspected the training school there were only five students, though there were places for sixty. Reverend William Gover was appointed the first Principal, Lyttelton the Chairman of the Governors, and the Bishop of Worcester the Visitor. Members of the Governing body included Pakington, Adderley, Newdegate, Spooner, the Earl of Harrowby, Lord Ward and T.G. Curtler. Adderley, Lyttelton, Pakington and the Bishop gave the largest annual subscriptions of £10 p.a. (2) By the third annual meeting there were twenty-eight students, fifteen of them Queen's Scholars, with a prospect of thirty-one more Queen's scholarships which would be competed for by examination at the College on 20 December. (3) Three years later, however, the numbers only stood at twenty-five. (4)

The system of Committee of Privy Council grants to education led to two major controversies with, and within the National Society. One of these concerned the

---

(1) N.S.R.O. Report of the Worcester Diocesan Board of Education, 28 April 1852.
(2) N.S.R.O. Report of the Second Annual Meeting of the Worcester Diocesan Training School, 21 October 1852.
(3) N.S.R.O. Report of the Third Annual Meeting of the Worcester Diocesan Training School, 20 October 1853.
(4) N.S.R.O. Report of the Worcester Diocesan Board of Education, 2 May 1855.

'management clauses' the other, the 'conscience clause'. (1) Many members of the Society, including Pakington, felt it unreasonable to exclude lay managers from schools which received state assistance, and as Pakington showed in his Commons speech of 1847 he had just regard for the consciences of Dissenters in Church schools. Many within the National Society would have welcomed a genuine concordat between Church and State on these two issues. But there were others who would not. For example, regarding the first issue, Archdeacon Denison, (2) doughty champion of the High Church party, insisted that "control over the entire order, teaching, and discipline of the school and over the appointment and dismissal of teachers, should be in the hands of the local clergy with appeal only to the Bishop." (3) A group largely composed of High Church and Tractarians, "the mediaeval party" as Kay-Shuttleworth termed them, bombarded the General Committee with memorials, and after the stormy annual meetings of 1848 and 1849 seemed to have prevented any permanent agreement between the State and the National Society on the management clause issue. But at the annual meeting of 1851 Denison suffered a significant defeat, and in 1852 over two hundred clergymen seceded from the National Society to set up the Church Education Society. Pakington played a part in both these developments, and the power of the Tractarians was much reduced. Manning and Newman went over to Rome, Denison failed to prevent Gladstone's election at Oxford in 1853, and was himself defeated on the Catechism issue at a meeting of the Bath and Wells Diocesan Board in 1855. These divisions and defeats

---

(1) Useful summaries of these issues can be found in H.J. Burgess, Enterprise in Education (1958), Ch. XI, and Apps. A, B.

(2) Denison's eventful career is portrayed in G.A. Denison, Notes of My Life, 1805-78 (1878), and L.E. Denison (ed.), Fifty Years at East Brent. The Letters of George Anthony Denison 1845-1896 (1902).

(3) Quoted in J. Murphy, Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1800-1970 (1971), 33.

emboldened the Aberdeen government to advise discontinuance of the Royal Letters in support of the National Society, from 1854, whilst successive governments secured the incorporation of management and conscience clauses in the trust deeds of new schools in receipt of state aid.

Matters came to a head at the National Society's annual meeting held on 4 June 1851. Throughout May the General Committee wrestled with the problem of how to prevent a major confrontation. Denison gave notice that he proposed to move "That this meeting deeply regrets that Her Majesty's Government continue to disallow the equitable claim of members of the Church of England, as set forth in the resolution of the Annual Meeting of this Society, June 6th 1849, that founders of Church Schools who see fit to place the management of their schools solely in the Clergyman of the parish and the Bishop of the diocese, should not, on that account, be excluded from State assistance towards the building of their schools." (1) The Reverend Edward Girdlestone wrote to the Committee giving notice that a counter resolution had been drawn up and would be moved by Lord Robert Grosvenor M.P. and seconded by Pakington. At the Committee meeting on 28 May the counter resolution was read; "That the cause of sound religious instruction, and the interests of the Church, demand, at the present juncture, the friendly co-operation of the National Society and the Committee of Council, and this meeting satisfied that such co-operation must be for the advantage of the National Society, as well as for the Church at large, desires to express its earnest hope that the two bodies may act cordially together." (2)

The Committee discussed the means of heading off such resolutions for the future, and adopted a resolution of

---

(1) N.S.R.O., National Society General Committee Minute Book, V, 242-3, 7 May 1851.
(2) Ibid., 248, 28 May 1851.

their own to be proposed on 4 June, but at their meeting on 2 June they abandoned this tactic and decided instead to "print and publish in the Morning Papers and circulate as widely as possible," the following statement:

> "The Committee of the National Society, to whom the management of its affairs is by the Charter exclusively entrusted, earnestly deprecate the discussion which they have reason to expect at the General Meeting of the Society on Wednesday next.
>
> They consider each and all of the propositions, of which individual members have given notice, alike unnecessary; and they deem the public discussion of them at the Annual Meeting calculated to embarrass the operations and to impair the efficiency of the Society ...."(1)

In the event the Committee's worst fears were realised.(2) Though Lord Grosvenor, who had been reluctant in the first place to propose his motion, now declined to proceed in deference to the Committee's statement, Pakington determined to press on. Long before the appointed opening hour the doors of the Central Schoolrooms were beset by a crowd of clergy and laity from all parts of the country. Shortly after noon, when the doors were opened, the spacious schoolroom was completely full. The audience was composed mainly of clergymen with not more than twenty ladies present. The Archbishop of Canterbury took the chair at one o'clock and, having expressed his regret at the resolutions which were to come, asked that a spirit of moderation should prevail and announced that the meeting would terminate at six.

The annual report having been read, Denison rose to move his resolution. He referred back to the history of the management clauses and to the great majority which

---

(1) Ibid., 250, 2 June 1851.
(2) The account which follows is based upon reports in the Monthly Paper of the National Society, July 1851, and The Times, 5 June 1851. See also Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/6, Diary, 4 June 1851.

had declared at the meeting of 6 June 1849 its support for the right of founders of church schools to be aided by the Government provided the trust deeds were legal. To his resolution Denison now added a further clause; "That this meeting desires to express its sense of the very great importance of securing the most friendly relations and the most harmonious co-operation with the civil power, and of being enabled to accept assistance of every kind from the parliamentary grant for education, provided always that such co-operation and such assistance involve no interference direct or indirect, actual or virtual, with the doctrine or the discipline of the Church."

Though the exact significance of this addition was in general lost upon the audience, including Pakington, Denison now became highly controversial, and the speech which had hitherto been punctuated by cheers and counter cheers, was at times lost in a welter of confusion which reached a climax when Denison, having affirmed that the dependence of the Church of England was upon the right arm of her great King, warned that she "must beware how she sold the truth for gold (Shouts of "Oh Oh!", "Question!" and Cheers)".(1) With difficulty did the Archbishop restore order by advising members of the audience that only their silence during Denison's speech would give them the opportunity to reply later. The resolution was seconded by A.J. Beresford Hope M.P.

When Pakington rose to speak there was further uproar, for the Reverend Sanderson Robins claimed to have precedence with an amendment of which he had given notice prior to Pakington, an argument which broke out again during Pakington's speech. Robins' proposed amendment read "That it is of the utmost importance to preserve harmonious co-operation between the National Society and the Committee

---

(1) The Times, 5 June 1851.

of Council on Education; and that there is nothing in the present conditions annexed to Government Grants, which would justify its interruption." (1) The Chairman however recognised Pakington.

Pakington began by regretting Denison's motion and the course which had been taken at the Society's meetings in recent years. The public would come to see the Society either as a party, or as a stage for party conflict. Whilst differences of opinion were acceptable, and on occasion perhaps divinely inspired for the stimulation of Christian zeal, this was a National Society, concerned for the "principles of the whole established church" and recognizing the rights of both clergy and laity. "Was it likely that the laity would submit to any system under which there was even the semblance of their exclusion from taking their fair share in the education of the people?" If mutual concession and moderation did not prevail, if the Society assumed the mantle of one religious party, "men whose aid was wanted, - men with zeal for education - might be driven to leave a society where they found that instead of conciliating all there was only an endeavour to expand the particular objects of some."

He warned of the claims of those who supported secular education only, whose success would lead to the exclusion of all religious teaching from the schools. The clergy at present had great authority in the management of schools, Denison "had warned the Society not to barter the truth for gold; was there not something more valuable than gold which we ought to cultivate - namely discretion and Christian charity?" Pakington spoke in the interests of peace, he acknowledged the honest intentions of those who

---

(1) Sanderson Robins, A Speech delivered by the Reverend Sanderson Robins at the Meeting of the National Society, 4 June 1851 (1851).

brought forward such resolutions, but deplored the divisions which they produced in practice, and concluded by moving the amendment which Girdlestone had conveyed to the General Committee. The amendment was seconded by J.W. Childers M.P., and Robins was now allowed to speak, but not to move his own amendment. He declared his general support for Pakington as did Reverend Richard Burgess of Chelsea, Secretary to the London Diocesan Board of Education. Denison's supporters however were numerous and included J.G. Hubbard the Deputy Governor of the Bank of England who referred to the suggestion of the Daily News that Pakington's aim was "either to purge the Society of the offensive principles adopted at its last two general meetings, or to leave it entirely in the hands of the priestcraft."

Eventually the meeting was thrown into confusion once more when the Chairman refused to recognise C.A. Moody M.P. but consented to hear Pakington again. The Archbishop threatened to dissolve the meeting, Pakington withdrew the amendment and Denison's resolution was put. It was defeated. "The result which seemed to take many persons by surprise, was hailed with great cheering." (1) At 5.30 p.m. the meeting ended, and Pakington, "much complimented" (2) went to bed happy. On the next morning, at 10 a.m. he was married to Mrs Davies.

Pakington's speech brought several important consequences. One was the invitation to represent Oxford University, (3) another was to guarantee for Pakington an honourable place in the Church Education Society. For Pakington's prophecy "that men with zeal for education

---

(1) The Times, 5 June 1851.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/6, Diary, 4 June 1851.
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/11/(iv)/3, Dr. Macbride, Principal of Magdalen Hall to Pakington, 18 January 1854. Like Pakington, Macbride became a Vice-President of the Church Education Society.

might be driven to leave a society ..." was soon fulfilled.

The work of the Church of England Education Society has received little recognition from historians. H.J. Burgess was mistaken in suggesting that "only the first two Annual Reports of the Church Education Society appear to be extant," [1] for those for 1857 and 1858 are also available in the British Library. The view that the new Society stemmed from the fact "that in 1853 two or three hundred Evangelical clergymen marched out of the National Society's Annual Meeting to form a society of their own," [2] is also open to question, for that meeting took place in mid-June, a clear three weeks after the formal launching of the Church Education Society at a meeting at Willis's Rooms on 25 May 1853. Other evidence suggests that the Society's origins can be traced back at least until 1852. Reverend William Pound [3] in A Letter in reply to papers issued by the Committee of the Church Education Society in July 1852 and January 1853 (1853), referred to the existence in London of "a Committee sitting for two years, composed of influential metropolitan clergymen and laymen, and that the result has been to induce between four and five hundred gentlemen to attend the meeting last June, many of whom have said they will not attend again." [4]

The first annual meeting was held at Willis's Rooms on 25 April 1854. The Society's office was established

---

(1) H.J. Burgess, Enterprise in Education (1958), 144.
(2) Ibid., 142.
(3) Reverend William Pound M.A., Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, and later Principal of Appuldurcombe, Isle of Wight and an inspector of schools. His educational views are summarized in his Remarks upon English Education in the nineteenth century (1866).
(4) p. 1. This point is examined in more detail in R.E. Aldrich, 'Uncertain Vintage, the Origins of the Church of England Education Society', History of Education Society Bulletin, XVIII, 1976.

at 11 Adam Street, Adelphi, and its first chairman was J.C. Colquhoun, until recently a member of the National Society's General Committee, a supporter of the National Club, (1) and a doughty Protestant champion both within Parliament and without. The first list of eleven Vice-Presidents included the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Bishop of Manchester, Lord Charles J.F. Russell and the Reverend Lord Wriothesley Russell. The Committee was to comprise forty clergy and forty laymen. Amongst the former were Reverend T.R. Birks, Reverend Richard Burgess, Reverend W.S. Gilly D.D. of Durham, and Reverend Edward Girdlestone, whilst the laymen included several M.P.'s; W. Evans, C.H. Frewen, G.C. Glyn, Hon. Arthur Kinnaird, Sir Charles Lemon, R.D. Mangles, C.A. Moody and Pakington. (2)

The Church Education Society aroused considerable opposition and there were harsh accusations levelled against its members who, having failed to obtain a majority within the National Society were now making "an attempt to pander to the opinions of the populace in order to obtain their money, and, when in possession of the unrighteous mammon, to set yourselves up as the representatives of the Church by treading Episcopal authority under your feet, and by ignoring the office of the Church, to serve and obey God rather than men." (3)

The Society's objective was "To promote National Education on Protestant and Church of England principles, and to diffuse sound opinions on the subject." (4) It

---

(1) Pakington himself declined to join the National Club, "a thoroughly Protestant and Church of England Association". Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/16/(xi)/24, Pakington to Newdegate, 1 February, 1853.

(2) A mixed bag indeed! 2 Conservatives, 3 Liberals, 1 Protectionist, 1 Reformer and 1 Whig. C.R. Dod, Parliamentary Companion (1852).

(3) W. Pound, A Letter in reply to papers issued by the Committee of the Church Education Society, in July 1852, and January 1853 (1853), 4.

(4) The details which follow are taken from the First Annual Report of the Church Education Society (1854).

sought to achieve these ends by making grants to training colleges, to those training to be teachers, and to teachers themselves. Assistance would also be given towards school-building and the purchase of school requisites. Information would be supplied on schoolbooks, and the furtherance of national education would be promoted through the press, persons in authority and the public at large. The Society's only condition for aid was to be satisfied as to the piety and general competence of the teacher and to the general condition of the school. Regular annual aid would be promised to schools in poorer areas. Training colleges could apply to come into official connexion with the Society, and in 1854 at the time of the first annual meeting these numbered three, the Cheltenham Training College, the Home and Colonial School Society in Grays Inn Road and the Metropolitan Training Institution at Highbury. The receipts of the Society up to 31 March 1854 totalled £4,834 3. 10d. and the Report of the Committee, adopted at the annual meeting on 25 April 1854, gave details of forty-four grants to schools and of fifteen grants to candidates for training.

Lord Calthorpe chaired the first annual meeting, the Secretary, Reverend G.E. Tate read the Report, referred to above, and Pakington moved the first resolution, namely, the adoption of the Report, the confirmation of the Standing Rules of the Society, and the re-election of the sixteen retiring members of the Committee. Pakington could not claim to be a founder of the Society as such, indeed he probably only became a formal member in 1854, but he clearly occupied a very prominent place in the proceedings on 25 April. He declared himself on that day still to be a member of the National Society, to be one who hoped for eventual reunion between the two groups, and one who deplored division in religion except where it was essential to principle. In so doing he was echoing the words of Calthorpe who had regretted the necessity of establishing the Church Education Society at all. But

Pakington moved on to a more positive approach. He naturally praised the Society's arrangements for the management of schools and the safeguarding of conscience; "Not relaxing one iota of the paramount importance of religious teaching - not leaning in the slightest degree to what is called the secular system, but consenting to give our religious teaching in a more tolerant spirit than has hitherto prevailed in this country." Having castigated the present and past governments for their lack of effort he declared that unhappily in the educational field there was still room for the efforts of all. Pakington then came to his most important theme. He referred to Kay-Shuttleworth's estimate, that "There appear to be nearly 12,000 schools which are at too low an ebb to be brought within the benefits of any Government grant." This figure had been quoted in the Committee's report and Pakington drew attention to "the destitution, not of schools, but of whole districts, ... where, from poverty or neglect, they have no schools at all." Though Pakington fully endorsed the Society's plans to give grants to schools and prospective teachers most in need of aid he was realistic enough to recognize that no permanent and comprehensive solution could be constructed on this basis. He called instead eventually for "something more like a National System of Education - an effort on the part of a nation more worthy of the great object we ought to contemplate than anything we have yet seen."

Thus in his speech Pakington declared support for three agencies for education; for the National Society, for the Church Education Society, and ultimately for a national system to fill up the gaps which the voluntary agencies could not supply. Such latitudinarianism probably ensured that Pakington's first major contribution to the Society's proceedings would also be his last. Pakington's name was not included in the list of those who attended the second annual meeting held on 24 April 1855 when

Lord Charles J.P. Russell took the chair.[1] There were, however, several references, not all complimentary, to Pakington's educational work, and in particular to his Bill then before the Commons. Criticisms of the measure were based upon the general fear of rate-aided education, and even Reverend J.C. Miller, Rector of St. Martin's, Birmingham, and Honorary Canon of Worcester, who spoke very warmly of Pakington and his motives in a personal sense, declared that "there is one point upon which Sir John Pakington ought to be met firmly though in a spirit of gratitude and respect, and that is on the question of free education. I believe that free education will be an entire and total mistake."

Nevertheless by 1857 when Pakington's next Bill was introduced the Society's list of Vice-Presidents included eight bishops and three M.P.s, Sir E.N. Buxton, C.A. Moody and Pakington. The annual meeting of that year was held in the National Club on 20 May with Shaftesbury in the Chair,[2] but Pakington who had attended the meeting of the previous year "for a few minutes"[3] only, appears not to have been present. By 1858 the Society was facing serious financial problems, expenditure in the previous year having exceeded income by £537.[4]

Thus in 1851 Pakington, by his independent attitude in education, had become a leading protagonist in the National Society, by 1855 he was a controversial figure in the Church Education Society, and in 1852 this independence began to affect his political career. The Derby government in 1852 amended the management clauses to permit the clergyman to dismiss or suspend a teacher on either moral or religious grounds. On 21 June Russell attacked the new Minute in the Commons as a measure which

---

(1) Second Annual Report of the Church Education Society (1855).
(2) Fourth Annual Report of the Church Education Society (1857).
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/8, Diary, 15 May 1856.
(4) Fifth Annual Report of the Church Education Society (1858).

would downgrade the schoolmaster and separate the clergy and laity in the work of education. A deputation from the Metropolitan Church Schoolmasters' Association waited on Russell and implored his aid, and on 19 February 1853 a further deputation waited upon Granville, the new President of the Council. On 2 April 1853 the offending Minute was cancelled. (1)

Pakington, as a member of the Committee of Council, (2) had opposed the Minute. The matter was discussed in the Council on 5 June although the actual form of words was not available to its members. When Pakington had perused the new form and compared it with the existing clauses he wrote to Derby, and to Lonsdale the Lord President, "to express my dissent from that alteration, and my earnest hope that it will not be carried into effect without further deliberation." (3) Pakington listed three objections to the new form, of which the most fundamental was his refusal to "consent to give to the clergyman alone the power of suspension." Cabinet uncertainties were revealed both in the Commons by Walpole on 9 June, and in the Lords by Derby two days later, when in a reply to Lansdowne he admitted that "a Minute has been agreed to in substance, though not yet in exact words." (4)

---

(1) A. Tropp, The School Teachers (1957), 48-9.
(2) Though Pakington's name was not included in the original list of the Committee of Council on Education appointed on 5 April 1852 Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education (1851-2), I, 40, he was noted as a member by C.R. Dod, Parliamentary Companion (1852). This is confirmed by D.G. Paz in his article, 'The Composition of the Education Committee of the Privy Council, 1839-1856', Journal of Educationnl Administration and History, VIII (2), 1976, 6. Pakington served on the Committee from 11 May 1852.
(3) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 6 June 1852.
(4) Hansard, CXXII, 468, 11 June 1852.
The Minute was dated 12 June 1852, and together with the Minute of 2 April 1853 can be found in Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education (1852-3), I, 11-13.

Though he did not carry his opposition to the Minute of 1852 to extreme lengths, the events of 1851-3 were crucial to the evolution of Pakington's concept of national education. He had the highest regard for the institutions of the country, Crown, Church and Parliament, and he was ever conscious of the particular educational responsibilities of the Established Church. (1) But by 1851 Pakington had come to doubt that the National Society, as then constituted and controlled, was truly representative, in educational matters, of the National Church. He was clearly not alone in this. (2) For though the National Society and its Committee had originated from the High Church party, Evangelicals like Ashley, Close and Stowell who in 1839 had stood firmly by the Society in its confrontations with the Government, and by the Committee in 1846, were dismayed by the Tractarians' capture both of the Committee and the Society in the later years of that decade. Pakington was at one with those Evangelicals like Close who approved of the management clauses, of the need to relax the terms of union in favour of the Dissenters, and who were highly suspicious of the mediaeval ritual of St. Mark's College, Chelsea. Some Evangelical clergymen refused to read the Queen's Letter, others having read it from the pulpit preached against it. (3) Many, like Close, disgusted by the "bear garden" of the National Society's annual meetings, saw the Society as "a great fog bag... managed by a little clique." (4)

---

(1) Indeed the purpose of the National Society, as defined at the foundation meeting of 16 October 1811, was "That the National Religion should be made the foundation of National Education ...."

(2) Witness the 2,845 signatures to the Memorial deposited with the Secretary of the National Society on 19 April 1852. J. Kay-Shuttleworth, Public Education (1853),19-21.

(3) Francis Close in a speech on 17 June 1853 at the inaugural meeting of the Cheltenham branch of the Church Education Society said that he had the names of over six hundred clergymen "dissatisfied and pained" at being called upon to read the Royal Letter. Cheltenham Journal, 18 June 1853.

(4) Ibid.

Pakington's opposition to Denison in 1851 had made him a hero in the Evangelical cause, (1) but his overall purpose, a truly national education, was not that of the Evangelicals whose prime concern was to "have a society of their own, by which they might carry out education according to their own fashion." (2) Though Pakington found himself in sympathy with many of the aims of the Church Education Society, for example the desire to give assistance to the poorer parishes, he reluctantly concluded that neither society could do more than play a part in his overall scheme. Pakington had hoped that the National Society, by broadening the basis of management of its schools, by exercising toleration in admitting to its schools the children of all believers, and non-believers, by co-operating with the civil power, would have become more truly national in character. But his intervention in the annual meeting of 1851, though it secured, much to the surprise of those present and of the country at large, the defeat of Denison's immediate proposal, had the longer term effect of sharpening the conflict between the Tractarian and Evangelical wings. It was also a factor contributing to the secession of the Evangelicals from the annual meeting of 1852.

Thus Pakington's intervention had not enhanced the national role of the National Society, but rather the reverse, and it was perhaps some feeling of guilt in this matter which led to his studied insistence on the residual responsibilities of the Established Church in his educational schemes. (3) By 1853, however, Pakington had come to the conclusion that only rate-supported education

---

(1) See, for example, the leading article in the Cheltenham Journal, 9 June 1851.
(2) Speech of Francis Close to the first annual meeting of the Cheltenham branch of the Church Education Society, 16 November 1854. Cheltenham Journal, 18 November 1854.
(3) That schools should be Anglican controlled unless there was a prior reason to the contrary.

boards could ensure that constant supply of good quality schooling for all children which alone would establish a national education worthy of the nation. Such a conclusion with its threat to denominationally controlled schooling was resisted by Tractarians and Evangelicals alike. Kay-Shuttleworth, however, considered that "Between the Reformers and the mediaeval party in the Church, there is a much larger body of clergy and laity desirous of peace, who would gladly promote a system of National Education, and feel no jealousy of the efforts of the Executive Government." (1) Thus Pakington would find himself attacked by both Denison and Henley on the one hand and Colquhoun and Close on the other. They were attacking his doctrine that national education, if it could not be based ultimately upon the national Church, must be based ultimately upon the national State. It is ironical that Pakington's decision to take up that cause in earnest was prompted by the intervention of a Bishop.

Pakington had strong connections with educational movements in the cities of Birmingham and Manchester. Dr. James Prince Lee, Headmaster of King Edward's, Birmingham whose letter of 1843 Pakington had quoted in full in his Commons speech of 22 April 1847, was in 1853 Bishop of Manchester and a Vice-President of the Church Education Society. (2) On 27 October 1853 Pakington received a letter from the Bishop requesting him to take charge of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill in the Commons in the Session of 1854.

---

(1) J. Kay-Shuttleworth, Public Education (1853), 22.
(2) He became the first Bishop of Manchester in 1847 and occupied the see for twenty-two years. There is an excellent appreciation in D. Newsome, Godliness and Good Learning (1961), Ch. II.

In the early 1850's Manchester was a hive of educational activity. The Lancashire Public School Association originated there in 1847, and in 1850 matured into the National Public School Association. Its early supporters included Bowring, Brotherton, Cobden, Ewart, Forster, Fox, Hume and Milner Gibson, under the presidency of Alexander Henry. But there were also opponents, and prominent among them was Kay-Shuttleworth. He applauded the Association's zeal for education but sadly concluded that he could not "conscientiously concur with them in seeking to establish a system of daily schools separate from the superintendence of the great religious bodies of the country, and in which the religious influence shall not pervade the whole discipline and instruction ...." (1) Accordingly in 1851 a rival body arose, the Manchester and Salford Committee on Education, of which William Entwistle was the chairman. Kay-Shuttleworth was a member of its Education Bill Committee.

On 1 January 1851 Reverend Charles Richson, Secretary of the Manchester Church Education Society, a body formed in 1844, invited a number of his immediate personal friends and others to the Society's rooms where "the plan was laid before them containing the main principles of that which has been subsequently developed into the Bill now before the House of Commons." (2) Five days later the Dean of Manchester presided at a meeting in the Mayor's parlour in the Town Hall at which the new Association was launched before the public. (3)

---

(1) Quoted in S.E. Maltby, Manchester and the Movement for National Elementary Education 1800-1870 (1918), 82.

(2) P.P., 1852, xi, Select Committee on Education (Manchester and Salford etc.), 113, 3 May 1852, Entwistle's evidence.

(3) There is an account of the Committee's work in S.E. Maltby, Manchester and the Movement for National Elementary Education 1800-1870 (1918), 83-9.

There were several Education bills introduced into the Commons in the early 1850's. The first was brought in by the Unitarian W.J. Fox, and backed by Henry and R.B. Osborne, M.P. for Middlesex, in February 1850. Though it lacked official L.P.S.A. backing its proposal to raise a local education rate, to be used only for secular education, won the support of Hume and the prevarication of Russell who declined "altogether to give any opinion as to the plan of the hon. Gentleman." (1) On the second reading, however, Ashley and Russell both opposed the Bill, and when ultimately a vote was taken on 5 June the measure was defeated by 287 votes to 58. (2) Pakington was numbered amongst the majority, as were Ashley, Disraeli, Gladstone, Graham and Peel. Hume and Milner Gibson acted as tellers for the other side.

Fox's Bill of 1850 proposed that surveys should be made of the extent of provision for secular education throughout the country. Where deficiencies existed popularly elected Education Committees should be empowered to raise a rate. The new free schools so supplied would cater for children between seven and thirteen. No religious instruction would be given by the teachers, but provision could be made by the parents at their own expense for their children to receive religious teaching. Existing schools would receive 10s. per annum for each pupil efficiently instructed in secular education, and could continue with their denominational instruction if they so wished. (3) On 22 May 1851 when Fox sought

---

(1) Hansard, CIX, 46, 26 February 1850.
(2) Hansard, CXI, 792, 5 June 1850.
(3) There is a useful summary in R. Garnett, The Life of W.J. Fox (1910), 301-6, though the account is virtually taken verbatim from Moncure D. Conway's lecture delivered at the South Place Chapel, on 10 May 1896. Graham Wallas, William Johnson Fox, 1786-1864 (1924) is the Conway Memorial Lecture delivered at the South Place Institute on 20 March 1924 to mark the centenary of Fox's arrival at the Chapel. The Bill of 1850 was reputedly devised there.

leave to move a resolution for the establishment of free schools for secular instruction he was again defeated, on this occasion by 139 votes to 49. (1)

On 11 February 1852 the second reading of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill was moved by Joseph Brotherton, (2) M.P. for Salford, and seconded by W. Brown, M.P. for Lancashire South. (3) Though Cardwell gave enthusiastic support, maintaining that Anglicans, Wesleyans and Independents in Manchester were all in its favour, Fox countered this with the argument that Catholics, Jews and Quakers were decidedly opposed. Milner Gibson suggested that consideration of the Bill should be postponed until the opinion of the Manchester Corporation had been taken, and he was supported in this view by both Bright and Gladstone. When the debate resumed on 17 March Milner Gibson, seconded by Roebuck, successfully moved for the appointment of a Select Committee, which was empowered "To inquire into the state of Education in the municipal boroughs of Manchester and Salford, and in the contiguous townships of Broughton, Pendleton, and Pendlebury, and whether it is advisable to make any further provision, and in what manner, for the education of the inhabitants within such boroughs and townships." (4) The Committee was a powerful one and included Bright, Brotherton, Cardwell, Cobden, Fox, Gladstone and Russell, with Milner Gibson as chairman, but its reports were inconclusive. In May a petition against the Bill was carried in the Manchester Town Council by 34 votes to 22.

---

(1) Hansard, CXVI, 1298, 22 May 1851.
(2) A subscriber to the Manchester and Salford Branch of the British and Foreign School Society, and a Vice-President and General Committee member of the L.P.S.A.
(3) Hansard, CXIX, 379, 11 February 1852.
(4) Hansard, CXIX, 1218, 17 March 1852.

Nevertheless the evidence collected by the Select Committee, which filled some 600 pages in the Report of 1852, (1) and a further 300 in 1853, (2) was closely studied by Pakington and formed the essential background to his educational activity in the years 1854-7.

In 1852 the Committee sat on fifteen days between 31 March and 21 June. They examined Charles Richson, William Entwistle, George Hull Bowers the Dean of Manchester and John Peel on behalf of the Manchester and Salford Committee, and Edward Baines and Joseph Adshead a representative of the Congregational Education Committee of Manchester, on behalf of the Voluntaryists. Horace Mann gave evidence on statistical matters and Alexander Kay, Mayor of Manchester 1843-5, on the existence of educational bequests. The Committee's Report in 1852 was therefore simply the evidence so far collected and a recommendation "that the inquiry should be resumed at an early period."

The Committee of 1853 sat on thirteen occasions between 7 March and 26 May. Many more witnesses were examined. Thomas Bazley, President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, Reverend William McKerrow D.D. Minister of the United Presbyterian Church, Richard Cobden, and John Watts Ph.D. a former schoolteacher and a member of the N.P.S.A.'s Executive Committee now presented evidence on its behalf. Other witnesses included another representative of voluntaryism, John Howard Hinton a Baptist minister, Thomas Binyon an Executive Committee member of the Manchester and Salford Committee who spoke on behalf of the Society of Friends, and John Kershaw and Lawrence Toole, Canons of the Roman Catholic Cathedral of Salford. Samuel Lucas spoke of the need for industrial schools and Leonard Horner reviewed the position of factories and education. An important contribution came from William Kennedy, former

---

(1) P.P. 1852, xi, 1.
(2) P.P. 1852-3, xxiv, 301.

Secretary to the National Society and now a school inspector with responsibility for the county of Lancashire. Schoolmasters consulted were William Hindshaw from an Anglican school in Salford, and Edmund Salter master of the Zion Chapel Independent School and Chairman of the General Manchester Association of Schoolmasters.

But neither conclusions nor recommendations were drawn from the hundreds of pages of written and oral evidence, the tables of statistics, the ingeniously coloured maps. On 26 May 1853 the Select Committee concluded "That the Evidence be reported, without any opinion thereon, to the House."

Whilst most Churchmen had resisted Fox, (1) the N.P.S.A. and the Secularists, the Manchester and Salford scheme raised more subtle questions for tender consciences. The Committee's decision that no child should be required to learn any distinctive religious creed, catechism or formulary, to which the parents should in writing object, had naturally aroused the fury of Denison, who had dashed off A Reply to the Editor of the Manchester Guardian and to William Entwistle (1851) and A Reply to the Committee of the Promoters of the Manchester and Salford Education Scheme (1851). He also took strong exception to the speech of Prince Lee, who as a diocesan bishop was a Vice-President of the National Society, to the promoters of the Bill in December 1851.

On the other hand Edward Girdlestone, Vicar of Deane, Lancashire, rejected both "Mr Denison's extreme of bigotry, and the National Public School Association's extreme of latitudinarianism," and welcomed the Manchester and Salford scheme. (2) Girdlestone quoted H.M.I. W.J. Kennedy's

---

(1) Conway claimed that Fox was "defeated by a combination of Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Wesleyans, Presbyterians and Independents." Garnett, op.cit., 302.

(2) E. Girdlestone, The Education Question (1852). This first appeared in the Church of England Quarterly Review, January 1852.

report in 1850 of the great need for "adequate and constant funds" (1) for education, and questioned whether the Diocesan Education Boards, which gave the appearance of "very ample and very satisfactory machinery" were in fact able to solve the problem. From such reasoning sprang the Church Education Society, but Girdlestone, like Pakington, saw this as only part of the answer, and he concluded by hailing "the glorious prospect of the poor-rate of Queen Elizabeth finding a suitable companion in the education-rate of Queen Victoria." (2) In 1852 both Denison and Girdlestone sought to impress their views upon the National Society, but neither had much success. By 1853 Girdlestone was a member of the Committee of the Church Education Society, whilst Denison's lament, The Position and Prospects of the National Society (1853), was dispirited in tone. He declared that the cancellation of the Minute of 12 June 1852 had "finally settled the whole Management Clause controversy in the sense of the Committee of Council" and that he would not expend any more of his time and energies upon the issue. Denison deplored the situation and concluded that "The Committee of the National Society are principally to blame for it." (3)

Other hopes were dashed in 1853. Neither the N.P.S.A. nor the Manchester and Salford Committee made any real progress in their educational schemes, and Russell's Education Bill which received a first reading in the Commons on 7 April was tamely abandoned.

Not surprisingly, therefore, Pakington replied in cautious vein in October to the Bishop's invitation. He asked for fuller information and for time to consider the implications. Prince Lee in his letter had referred to

---

(1) Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education (1850), II, 433.
(2) See also E. Girdlestone, The Committee of Council on Education, an imaginary enemy, a real friend (1850).
(3) p. 14.

the approbation which Pakington had often expressed in respect of the arrangements at King Edward's, and of Pakington's view that such principles if applied on a wider scale could overcome the religious or denominational impediments to the achievement of national education. The four principles which Pakington had now adopted were: that there should be full religious instruction in all schools in receipt of public aid; that religious instruction should be in accordance with the tenets of the denomination with which the school was connected; that in new schools established through public aid and unconnected with any particular denomination the doctrines of the Church of England should be taught; and finally that all children should be admissable to all schools and that no doctrinal teaching should be forced upon any child against the wishes of parents or guardians.

Pakington wrote to Derby [1] and enclosed the Bishop's letter. Though ostensibly Pakington sought to ascertain "whether you think it would be beneficial or otherwise to us as a party, for such a question to be in my hands," in effect he did his best to convince Derby that it would be politic for him to take up the education issue in Parliament. "I have no doubt" Pakington continued, "that many of our friends would decline to support me, and especially on the ground of objecting to an Education rate - but on the other hand it would not be in any sense a party motion, and I think our party interests might be promoted by an important Education measure, liberal and comprehensive and yet sound as to religious teaching being taken up on our side of the House - "

Pakington admitted that provided the details of the Bill were satisfactory he was disposed to take charge of its progress in the Commons. He saw the Manchester plan as "the greatest practical step for the remedy of a great

---

(1) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 28 October 1853.

National Evil and disgrace which has yet been proposed." But the most important paragraph of this long letter was that which contained Pakington's declaration in favour of rate-aided education. It was this issue which caused him to become separated from so many former colleagues like Ashley. But Pakington, by 1853 discouraged by Russell's timidity and by the inability of the voluntary societies, even when aided by government grants, to provide education for more than a proportion of the people, had come to see an education rate as the only sure means of finance. Experience of the Worcester Diocesan Board, and of the National Society, experience which would be confirmed by his membership of the Church Education Society, showed that however considerable original donations might be, the regular financing of education through subscriptions, particularly in the poorer areas of the country, was impracticable. Thus he declared to Derby: "The main feature of the Manchester Bill is the Education Rate, and to that I am disposed to give my adhesion - the objection to it which I always hear is that "it will paralyze voluntary exertions" - to this there are two answers - (1) I don't believe it will do so

(2) If it does, voluntary efforts have been found insufficient, and therefore we must turn to something else.

I trouble you upon this subject because I think it one of extreme importance - something must be done."

Derby's reply emphasized the importance of the Bill, which if passed, he thought, would become a model bill for all the heavily populated areas of the country, and he urged Pakington to proceed with caution. The warning was unnecessary. Pakington was at this time devoting much energy to mastering the intricate details of the subject. He ploughed through the evidence submitted to the Committee of 1852 and 1853, he sent Derby copies of the Bill, as originally drawn in the Session of 1852, and

of the report of a "great meeting" of 1851. On 7 November he wrote to Derby explaining that "Such an object is worth some labour - and I am disposed if I can obtain satisfactory modifications upon some few points, to undertake the task." (1)

Pakington's parliamentary colleagues viewed this prospect with considerable alarm. On 7 December it was one of the topics discussed by Henley and Walpole, and the latter wrote to Pakington from the Carlton Club expressing anxiety about the Manchester scheme and advising that some two years earlier when it was first mooted it "contained some doubtful provisions". (2) Johnny was anxious too about the effect of the Manchester discussions upon his father's standing in the party and he wrote on 19 December advising Pakington to insert a paragraph in the Worcester, if not the national press, stating that he had been unable to reach agreement with the Manchester and Salford Committee. (3)

Eventually Pakington declined to take charge of the Bill and he wrote to Derby on 22 December to advise him of this decision. (4) He had visited the Bishop in Manchester and had attended long meetings of the Bill Committee. At the second of these, two Dissenters moved and seconded a resolution based upon Pakington's proposal that new rate-financed schools, not otherwise connected, should be Anglican schools - established with full toleration and liberty for Dissenters. (5) The proposal was carried unanimously and Pakington returned to Westwood, but the Committee then reversed this decision and

---

(1) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 7 November 1853.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/2/(vi)/M/P/38, Walpole to Pakington, 7 December 1853.
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/2/(vi)/M/P/39, Johnny to Pakington, 19 December 1853.
(4) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 22 December 1853.
(5) Pakington appears here to have been influenced by the Act to make better Provision for the Contributions of Unions and Parishes in School Districts to the common Funds of the respective Districts. 13 and 14 Vict. c.11.

substituted a clause "which appeared to me so unsatisfactory and insufficient that I could not consent to propose it in the House of Commons."

Though Pakington would not propose the Bill he made by far the most important speech when the second reading took place in the Commons on 21 February 1854. Nevertheless there was little chance that the Manchester and Salford Bill of 1854 would reach the Statute Book. Milner Gibson who led the opposition produced powerful arguments in support of his amendment. He and Bright, the M.P.s for Manchester, both opposed the Bill, the Manchester Town Council had declared unanimously against it, whilst the Select Committee reports of 1852 and 1853 had shown that educationists in Manchester were so divided that no scheme for the area could command general support. Sir George Grey, a member of the Select Committee, in a moderate speech on the Bill admitted as much. "... after all the evidence before the Committee last year, he was unable to satisfy himself whether the preponderant opinion was in favour of the scheme. There was one party who advocated voluntary efforts, thought no legislation necessary, and objected to levying rates altogether - who told the Committee, and endeavoured by witnesses to prove, that voluntary efforts were producing immense results, and would provide an adequate remedy for the want of education, throughout the masses of the community. There were two other parties, the one advocating this scheme, the other what was called the national scheme, who agreed up to a certain point, but there widely diverged in opinion ... and he confessed he saw with regret, notwithstanding the time the Committee sat, no approximation towards an agreement of those parties, by giving up their extreme views and meeting on some common basis, on which they could join in recommending a

Bill to Parliament." (1)

In his efforts to overcome this fundamental objection Charles Bowyer Adderley, (2) M.P. for Staffordshire North, who had introduced the Bill (3) in Pakington's stead, advised that although nominally it was a local measure in fact its purpose was a general one. Normally private bills having been read a second time would be referred to a Select Committee, but Adderley proposed that this Bill should be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House so that there could be further full discussion. This proposed infringement of normal parliamentary practice enabled Milner Gibson, Russell and others to object to the Bill on procedural rather than educational grounds. Milner Gibson asked indeed whether the Government and the House were prepared to commit themselves to the principle of national education by means of a private bill. He used the analogy of the ballot. Could such a principle properly be introduced in a private cum public bill intended initially for one area only but thereafter for extension throughout the country.

The Manchester Corporation had petitioned that the Manchester and Salford Bill of 1854 should be deferred until some general measure had been proposed by the Government. Adderley had appealed to Russell not to "reject his own offspring, so brought back to his arms by the care of a foster parent." Many in the House of Commons on that Tuesday evening thus waited expectantly to hear Russell, but his speech was a disappointment.

---

(1) Hansard, CXXX, 1057-8, 21 February 1854.
(2) Benefactor of Saltley College, a Conservative who had voted for protection in 1846, a member of the Carlton Club and an opponent of concessions to the Roman Catholics.
(3) Hansard, CXXX, 1045-51, 21 February 1854.

and he concluded "I think we must pause some time before any general and uniform system of education can be successfully carried out." (1)

Pakington's hour-long oration,(2) on the other hand, lucid, informed and constructive, established his position as a leading authority on education within the Conservative party. At the same time the fresh proofs of Russell's timidity and inconstancy both in politics and education, gave Pakington the opportunity to bid for general parliamentary primacy in the cause of national education. His speech of 21 February was not merely, perhaps not mainly, a comment upon the Bill then before the House, but also a statement of his views upon, and commitment to, education.

Pakington began, indeed, with an attack upon Russell, expressing his "deep dissatisfaction" at his speech, and his dereliction of duty in thereafter departing from the Chamber. He deplored the fact that not one Cabinet minister was present, and adduced this as evidence of the "perfect carelessness" of the Government's attitude to education. In the previous year the Ministers had "held out education - and in his opinion, most correctly and justly so - as the grand requirement of the age" but Russell, having headed off other bills by his own measure, had abandoned it before the second reading, and the whole subject of education this year, in favour of "a Reform Bill, which nobody wanted."

He turned next to Milner Gibson, and was interrupted by both Bright and Milner Gibson for his pains. Pakington saw their intervention, and Milner Gibson's amendment, as a tactical and technical quibble, aimed at discrediting the Manchester and Salford Committee, not in the interest of education but as a means of saving the face of the N.P.S.A. Bright, to some extent admitted as much, when in replying to Pakington he emphasized that the L.P.S.A.

---

(1) Ibid., 1070.
(2) Ibid., 1073-84.

had been first in the field, and that as the N.P.S.A. had no hope of securing a private act based upon their principles, the passage of this Bill should be resisted as constituting the defeat of "the other party who first moved in this matter." (1)

Pakington then proclaimed his support for the three principles upon which the Bill was based; "that education ought to be universal - that education ought to be religious; but, at the same time, that that religious teaching should be conducted upon the fairest and most tolerant principles."

On the first point Pakington declared that Britain "had no system of education deserving the name of a national system. Nor was it worthy of this country to be lagging behind the rest of the world on such a subject." He quoted from three authorities to show the extent of educational deficiency. The Registrar General's returns for 1851 showed that of a population of 18,000,000, 2,100,000 were stated to be on the school books, though only 1,750,000 were actually known to attend school - some 1 in 10 of the population. (2) Dr. Guthrie's statement to the Commons Committee of 1853 however had shown that in the United States, in the North Eastern states of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey and

---

(1) Ibid., 1085.
(2) Pakington had clearly mastered both P.P. 1852-3, lxxxix, 1, Census of Great Britain, 1851. Religious Worship (England and Wales), and ibid., xc, 1, Census of Great Britain, 1851. Education (England and Wales). E.A. Wrigley (ed.), Nineteenth-Century Society: Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data (1972) is largely concerned with the evaluation of census material and includes a contribution from B.I. Coleman on 'The incidence of education in mid-century'.

New York, 1 in 6 of the population attended school, and even in the poorer slave states, North Carolina 1 in 10, and Georgia and Louisiana 1 in 12. (1) Similar evidence was provided by the statistical tables of Keith Johnston, (2) who calculated that only 1 in 12 of the country's population were receiving education, whereas in Prussia, Switzerland and Denmark the figure was 1 in 6, and in Norway, Sweden, and parts of France and Holland 1 in 6½.

These figures, Pakington concluded, "proved that something ought to be done beyond the voluntary system. And he had himself, therefore, come to the conclusion, though reluctantly and with hesitation, that at least in the case of the populous districts of England, resort must be had to an educational rate." He adduced the examples of education in the United States and of the poor law in England to show that compulsory rating need not necessarily destroy voluntary exertions. He insisted that "all ought to have access to the education so provided; they must make it universal, and, in his opinion, they ought to make it free."

---

(1) The concept, or on occasion the myth, of the American common school produced strong reactions from nineteenth-century English educationists. See, for example, E. Twistleton (ed.), Evidence as to the Religious Working of the Common Schools in the State of Massachusetts (1854), which includes evidence given to the Select Committee on Manchester and Salford Education. Other contemporary comments include J. Sinclair, Remarks on the Common School System of the United States... (1857), and J. Collings, An Outline of the American School System ... (1868). Though Pakington approved of some features of the American systems he was anxious about their religious effects. See also W.H.G. Armytage, The American Influence on English Education (1967); P.N. Farrar, 'American Influence on the Movement for a National System of Elementary Education in England and Wales, 1830-1870', British Journal of Educational Studies, XIV (1), 1965; and D.K. Jones, 'Lancashire, the American Common School and the Religious Problem in British Education in the Nineteenth Century', British Journal of Educational Studies, XV (3), 1967.

(2) Alexander Keith Johnston (1804-1871), Geographer to the Queen in Scotland. Pakington's reference to Johnston's statistics at a meeting on reformatory institutions at Birmingham earlier in the year, had led to several attacks upon him in the press for an over-gloomy appraisal of the situation.

Universal, free, rate-supported education: so far Pakington had said little from which N.P.S.A. supporters would dissent. But he now turned to his second principle, that education should be religious. Even here there was room for agreement. The N.P.S.A. never became the National Secular School Association, it always numbered ministers of religion amongst its adherents. (1) The N.P.S.A.'s fundamental answer, adopted by the General Committee on 4 December 1850, to the religious difficulty, however, was to close the schools at prescribed times each week, to allow pupils the opportunity of obtaining religious instruction in other places. (2) Pakington declared himself to be, "most decidedly opposed to the purely secular system ... he believed that any such system would be wholly repugnant to the feelings of the people of England." Again he quoted the example of the U.S.A. and of evidence to Milner Gibson's Committee on this point "how the doctrines and principles of Christianity had been, to a great extent, undermined in America, in consequence of the want of religious instruction in schools." Pakington saw a missionary element in the extension of schooling to the children of those families which never attended a place of worship, and this was for him an essential element of any plan for national education. For this reason he accepted the principle of free schooling, and deplored Russell's view that "no one ought to be assisted from the rates who did not pay for their own schooling."

Thus Pakington came to his third theme, that religious teaching in a national system must be conducted upon the fairest and most tolerant principles. Again he called upon the National Society to relax its attitude on doctrinal

---

(1) For secular education in this period see V.G. Toms, 'Secular education in England 1800-1870', London University Ph.D. thesis, 1972.

(2) See S.E. Maltby, Manchester and the Movement for National Elementary Education 1800-1870 (1918), Apps. VIII, IX, for details of N.P.S.A. schemes.

teaching, and to allow the children of Dissenters guaranteed rights within Anglican schools. Again he quoted the example of King Edward's Birmingham. And he now voiced the proposal which he had urged upon the Manchester and Salford Committee, that in destitute districts, where there were no denominational schools, a new school should be established on the principles of the Established Church, but with full recognition of Dissenters' rights. As when writing to Derby in 1853 he instanced the Act of 1850 establishing district pauper union schools which had proceeded upon that principle, and the general arrangements for religious ministrations in goals and workhouses.

In conclusion Pakington returned to the Bill itself. The petition of the Manchester Corporation had not opposed the principle of the Bill, merely its status as a private bill, whilst on the other hand 40,000 (1) of the rate-payers had petitioned that the Bill should pass. Pakington admitted that he personally saw the Bill as "a model from which the House might derive sound principles for extending universal instruction to all the populous and destitute districts of the country," and he advised that "Although he did not exactly approve of the plan of conveying education as proposed by this Bill, he considered it on the whole as a noble measure - the most important measure upon education that had ever been laid upon the table of that House."

Eventually Milner Gibson's amended amendment that, "Education to be supported by public rates is a subject which ought not at the present time to be dealt with by any private Bill" was put, and carried by 105 votes to 76. (2)

---

(1) There was some controversy over these figures and how they were collected. See the evidence of John Peel to the Select Committee of 1852.
(2) Hansard, CXXX, 1111, 21 February 1854.

As those who had stayed to vote made their ways through the chill air of the early hours of a February morning to home, hotel or club, the prospects for a new parliamentary impetus for education must have seemed bleak indeed.

No local act for Manchester could be entertained in the immediate future, in spite, or almost because, of the great interest in education exhibited there. Neither could the N.P.S.A. expect to be successful with a national scheme bearing the secular stigma. Russell, whose parliamentary energy and pluck had achieved so much for education in the 1830's and 1840's, and had earned him the admiration of both Gladstone and Kay-Shuttleworth, was now basically resigned to abiding by the grants system. His efforts at re-opening the educational issue, the Bills of 1853 and 1855, and the resolutions of 1856, were characterized by timidity and irresolution, that same timidity and irresolution exhibited by Russell in the hour of the fall of the Aberdeen government. The advent of a Palmerstonian administration, firmly committed to the more effective prosecution of the war, in itself boded ill for education.

But the events of 1854, and in particular the demise of the Manchester and Salford Bill, had a profound effect upon Pakington. He now resolved to take upon himself the leadership of the educational cause in Parliament.

Chapter Three

THE BILL OF 1855

Though Pakington contemplated bringing in an education bill of his own in 1854, preliminary discussions with Derby and Disraeli were not promising, and he contented himself with pursuing his attack upon Russell. Thus on 30 June when the vote of £263,000 for Education was moved in the Committee of Supply, Pakington deplored Russell's failure to take his Bill to a second reading in 1853, or to reintroduce it in 1854. The exchange between the two men on this occasion contained an important matter of principle, for Russell maintained that inasmuch as one in eight of the population were now in schools the government grant should be expended to improve the quality of education. Pakington on the other hand not only questioned the accuracy of this figure, but argued for a ratio of one in six and urged the Government to bring in a bill. Pakington's attacks on Russell, whether over education or the conduct of the war, were of value to his party, and on 31 January 1855, after the resignation of the Aberdeen government, the Queen asked Derby to form a new administration. But when it became clear that Pakington intended not merely to castigate the Aberdeen government over education but also to introduce his own bill, with or without official Conservative support, he created a major crisis within the party.

Pakington summarized his own position in a letter to Disraeli: "After the failure of the Manchester and Salford Bill last session, and the apparent abandonment of the education question by the Government, I did consult you and Lord Derby as to the expediency of our at once seizing the vacant ground.

I expressed my inclination from feelings both of public duty and party policy to bring in a general Bill.

You and Lord Derby concurred in the policy and encouraged the idea - but I found the subject too large and too difficult for me to prepare a Bill while pressed by the current business of the session, and I gave up the idea then - but before the end of the session I gave a notice that I should introduce a measure this year." (1)

Parliament had reassembled in mid-December 1854 and Pakington gave notice before Christmas of his intention to move for an education bill on 25 January. Lytton (2) wrote inquiringly, Adderley in encouragement, "Surely the war need not stop it, it may even improve its chance of success." (3) J.E. Denison who had, after conversations with Canon Richson and Lord Harrowby, given notice of a "Bill to provide for the Education of the Children of Paupers receiving relief out of the Workhouse", also expressed his support. (4) But on the same day Pakington received a letter from Walpole, (5) one of his strongest supporters in the campaign to secure 'preconcert and prearrangement' within the Conservative party both in and out of office, which emphasized "the propriety of consultation ... for the first duty in my opinion, is when we see so many perils around us to keep the Conservative party together." Walpole's opposition to

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/18, Pakington to Disraeli, 7 January 1855.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/ M/P/43, Lytton to Pakington, 29 December 1854.
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/ M/P/44, Adderley to Pakington, 29 December 1854.
(4) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/ M/P/45, Denison to Pakington, 30 December 1854.
(5) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/16/(x)/3, Walpole to Pakington, 30 December 1854.

the Bill, however, was based on more fundamental grounds. He rightly predicted that "Henley would continually oppose it," whilst Walpole himself, in common with the majority of the party refused to countenance an education rate, and he urged Pakington to consultation partly to convince him that his Bill would stand little chance of success.

Pakington was at Westwood in January, he presided at the Quarter Sessionson the first three days of the month, on the 5th at the annual meeting of the Saltley Reformatory, and returned "home to dinner - long talk on education with Adderley and Bellairs." (1) On the same day Disraeli, furious at Pakington's Education notice, wrote from Hughenden; "The movement which without any communication with any of us you have thought fit to make, has seriously disturbed all this and placed us all in an inconvenient and embarrassing position. It is quite impossible for any individual, who has been a Cabinet Minister, and still occupies one of the most prominent situations in opposition, to introduce any general question of large interest to Parliament on his own responsibility alone ...." (2) The 'all this' to which Disraeli referred was that had it not been for the war the Conservatives might well have taken up the question of education, and that nevertheless Walpole had been "preparing some materials for us to consider with Lord Derby." Pakington's lengthy reply recalled his consultations with Derby and Disraeli in 1854, and expressed "some surprise that, if Walpole has been collecting materials, and this subject is to be considered at the first meeting of our friends after the recess, I have never received the least intimation

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/7, Diary, 5 January 1855.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/7/(11)/5, Disraeli to Pakington, 5 January 1855.

from any one that such an intention existed." (1) Pakington declared that his notice had been given because he had come to know "accidentally and in confidence that Lord John Russell is preparing a Bill ... I wish to move according to my notice, on 25th and get the start of the Government and make the subject our own.

I have however always intended, and it was upon this point more than any other that I wished to consult you, to bring in my Bill as an independent M.P., not as the organ of a party - " As a precedent for such a move Pakington cited Walpole's Bill to prevent bribery at elections.

Foreknowledge of Russell's intentions had not been the only reason for Pakington's precipitate action. He knew well enough that his scheme would never have received official Conservative backing, and that whatever concessions he might make Henley and Manners would oppose the very principle of a bill itself. But Pakington hoped that concessions might be made by the secular party, and in reference to a discussion with Cobden in 1854 he concluded, "we differed very little - he is really anxious for a national system on moderate principles, and is, I believe, ready to make concessions to obtain it."

On the following day Pakington wrote to Derby, (2) a letter in many respects identical to that to Disraeli, but one which concluded by asking whether Stanley could be persuaded to come to Westwood to discuss the issue. Stanley was persuaded. He set aside other engagements, arrived on Tuesday 11th and stayed until the following Monday. There were "long discussions with Stanley on education plan - he approves ... and much education and political talk." (3) Pakington now felt ready to send a

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/18, Pakington to Disraeli, 7 January 1855.
(2) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 8 January 1855. He also wrote separately to Stanley.
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/7, Diary, 11-15 January 1855.

twelve point outline [1] of his proposed Bill to political colleagues and other interested parties. The reactions were not encouraging. Henley politely but frankly declined to offer any opinion on the details inasmuch as he opposed both the fact and the principle of the Bill. [2] John Bright advised Pakington that he "could not consent to the religious portion of the Bill" and that he had "no hope of any general measure unless it is agreed to give up any legislation on the religious question." [3] Cobden expressed his "deliberate conviction that no Educational measure will work which does not separate dogmatic religious teaching so far from all secular instruction as to allow the rates to be devoted solely to the payment of the latter." [4] Derby judged that it would not be "politic for you to proceed at this moment," [5] but the strongest opposition came in a long and weighty letter from Chartwell from Colquhoun. [6] His objections centred upon the principle that "Whenever schools obtain the sanction of the State and the support of the Rates they will make the competition of other schools so unfavourable as to be impossible." [7] He warned Pakington that his Bill would,

---

(1) Pakington had however sent an earlier outline to Bulwer Lytton in reply to his letter of 29 December 1854, and one in a briefer form to Walpole.

(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/48, Henley to Pakington, 19 January 1855.

(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/58, Bright to Pakington, 1 February 1855.

(4) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 8-10, Cobden to Pakington, 13 January 1855. There is a copy of the same letter in the Cobden Mss. 30, in the West Sussex Record Office (hereafter W.S.R.O.).

(5) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/55, Derby to Pakington, 25 January 1855.

(6) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/49. Colquhoun to Pakington, 20 January 1855; weighty in more than one sense for it was in excess of the ½ oz. ld rate.

(7) Though Colquhoun had himself advocated a parish rate for education in his pamphlet, On the Measures to be now taken in order to secure a good National Education (1853).

within a week, "find arrayed against it all the religious parties in England." Other more encouraging replies which nevertheless suggested advice or amendments to the scheme included those from Archdeacon Sinclair, (1) from the Tractarian M.P. J. Napier, (2) from Cromwell (3) and Gilly (4) of Durham, from Lords Blandford (5) and Brougham. (6) Even Adderley (7) was cautious in his response, for though expressing general approval he felt the need "to think over twice before venturing any opinion." Pakington was not deterred by these responses. The rough draft of the Bill had been completed by W.T. Haly (8) by 11 January, and when sending a copy of the Outline to Disraeli, Pakington stated that he would move the Bill independently, and only after it had been printed, "let us discuss it at Grosvenor Gate, and ascertain the feeling of the party with respect to it." (9)

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/50, Sinclair to Pakington, 20 January 1855.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/53, Napier to Pakington, 24 January 1855.
(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/51, Cromwell to Pakington, 23 January 1855.
(4) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/56, Gilly to Pakington, 25 January 1855.
(5) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/54, Blandford to Pakington, 24 January 1855.
(6) University College, London (hereafter U.C.L.), Brougham Mss. 5704, Pakington to Brougham, 8 March 1855, and 5705, Pakington to Brougham, 10 March 1855.
(7) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/47, Adderley to Pakington, 17 January 1855.
(8) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/46, Haly to Pakington, 11 January 1855.
(9) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/20, Pakington to Disraeli, 15 January 1855.

Pakington maintained his independence, not to say isolation, on this issue until 25 January. His approaches to Bright and Cobden had met with no specific response, and he continued to attack Russell personally in the Commons both over education and the conduct of the war. Meanwhile whilst ostensibly urging Russell to introduce another bill, Pakington was justifying his own precipitate action in giving notice of a bill without consulting his colleagues on the very grounds that he knew Russell was preparing a bill! Pakington had acted first and asked questions afterwards, a realistic procedure in many ways, but it meant that his success or failure would depend almost entirely upon his personal performance in presenting the Bill in the Commons.

Parliament resumed on Tuesday, 23 January when Russell "gave notice of Education Bill <u>for Friday</u>! " On Wednesday Pakington called on Haly about his own Bill and on Thursday, when Pakington was "busy in preparing for Education speech this evening. Lord Derby sent for me about point in Bill - advised me not to go on - he thought affairs so critical that he had considered how to form government - House of Commons - heard that <u>Lord John had resigned</u> - all motions given up." (1)

---

(1) <u>Hampton Mss</u>. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/7, Diary, 23 and 25 January 1855.

"Outline of Education Bill (1)

1. Act to be general for England and Wales: but everywhere permissive.

2. Areas for working the Act to be, in Towns the limits of Municipal Jurisdictions. Elsewhere, the Poor Law Unions.

3. Town Councils in Towns, Ratepayers in Unions or parts of Unions, (amended to - Ratepayers in Towns or Unions ...) may adopt Act for their respective localities.

4. In every Town or Union, or part of Union, in which Act has been adopted, Ratepayers to elect an Education Board to act for such locality. Elections to be annual.

5. Education Boards to have power to levy Education Rate

   To provide schools where necessary
   To superintend Education in the District
   To regulate Expenditure of Rate
   To exercise generally the Functions entrusted to them by the Act.

6. All existing Schools to come under the Act or not, at their Discretion. But the management of existing Schools which come into Union not to be interfered with, except that they must submit to two Conditions in consideration of receiving assistance from the Rate.

   1. Annual Inspection
   2. Adoption of the Rules with respect to Religious Teaching prescribed by the Act.

7. New Schools established by Local Boards, and founded and supported by Rates and public Funds to be Free Schools.

   Existing Schools coming into Union to admit Free Scholars under direction of Board; but to be generally conducted as at present.

---

(1) This 'Outline' is taken from the handwritten enclosure which Pakington sent to Derby with his letter of 11 January 1855, Derby Mss. 141/9, but the capitalization, punctuation and general order is based upon the almost identical printed version which Pakington sent to Brougham on 10 March 1855, U.C.L. Brougham Mss. 5705.

8. Local Rates to be assisted in fixed proportion by Committee of Council from Annual Parliamentary Grant.

9. Committee of Council to have Power to issue Rules for Guidance of Local Boards, and to exercise General Superintendence analagous to that exercised by Poor Law Commission.

10. Every School in Union to be annually inspected by Inspector under authority of Committee of Council. Reports upon the Condition of Schools in Union to be annually made - and a satisfactory Report to be in each case the Condition of Assistance from Public Funds.

11. Schools of all Religious Denominations (recognised by Committee of Council) to be equally entitled to Assistance from the Rates, provided only that no Child shall be excluded from any School on religious grounds, and that no Creed or Catechism shall be forced on any Child in opposition to the written desire of his Parent or Guardian.

12. All new Schools founded under Act to be Church of England Schools - except, when it shall appear to the Local Board that the Majority of the Population in the District in which any School is to be established belongs to some other Denomination; and then the Committee of Council shall determine what shall be the Religious Teaching of that School. "

Pakington himself claimed in his letter of 11 January to Derby that this Outline was based on an "extension and combination" of three major sources, the Manchester and Salford Bill, Lord John Russell's Bill of 1853, and the administration of the Poor Law. Such a statement was, however, in one sense misleading. Although Haly and Pakington in drawing up the details of the actual Bill made frequent reference to the specific formulation of these earlier proposals, Pakington's Bill had a character of its own which was based upon his personal experience, values and judgements. His fundamental aim, the prime cause of his Bill, an aim which would transcend any disputes about the actual quantity and quality of education in the 1850's was to ensure "that the law of England should

recognize the duty of providing for the mind as well as for the body." This was essential to Pakington's concept of national education. He wanted an overall system, capable of providing education for all, and based upon the law. It was Pakington's experience of the problems of poor parishes, as highlighted by the reports of the Church Education Society, which led him to insist upon the provision of free schooling. (1) It was Pakington's experience of the National Society which provided his justification for limited interference with the management of existing schools. (2) The implications of these proposals for the development of a central education authority, (3) one of Pakington's main themes in his work for national education, will be discussed in the next chapter. Pakington's commitment to the principles of toleration practised at King Edward's formed the basis of the eleventh clause, whilst his fundamental devotion to the Church of England emerged in the final section. This principle, the residual educational rights of the Established Church, a feature of the proposals of Brougham in 1820 and Graham in 1843, Pakington maintained in spite of the results of the 1851 religious census. In this connection Pakington still believed that though the total numbers of the Dissenting communities might appear to equal the supporters of the Anglican Church, no single sect could rival its position in educational matters, and he frequently referred to the 1851 census figures that of the 12,708 day schools supported by the religious bodies 10,555 belonged to the Church of England.

Early reactions to Pakington's Outline had indicated where the main areas of opposition would occur. Leading opponents to the principle of a bill and specifically to a rate, would be Henley and Colquhoun. Bright and Cobden

---

(1) Clause 7.
(2) Clause 6.
(3) Clauses 8,9, 10.

voiced the objections of Dissent and the Secularists to clauses eleven and twelve. Educationists Cromwell and Gilly questioned the first clause and argued for eventual, if not immediate, compulsion. (1) To Cromwell, however, free schools seemed an unnecessary luxury, whilst Sinclair cavilled at the expense of annual inspection.

The Bill "for the better encouragement and promotion of Education in England" as finally drafted by Pakington and Haly, however, showed only one major change from the Outline, inasmuch as the establishment of the Education Boards was everywhere left to ratepayer initiative. Sinclair had suggested that in large towns the unit might be too large, but Haly had advised against any purely parochial units inasmuch as poorer parishes might lack both the personnel and the financial resources to establish a board. Boards would be elected by ratepayers, and those rated at £30 per annum would be eligible as members. The extent of educational deficiencies would be ascertained, and rates levied up to a maximum of 6d. Boards would act under the general superintendence of the Committee of Privy Council, as Boards of Guardians acted under the Poor Law Commission, and would receive grants from the central authority. Pakington, however, rejected Haly's proposed concession to the Voluntaryists, that the School Boards should "decide upon scales of charges, with power to pay the charge for any children whose parents or guardians might not be in a position to pay for them," (2) and insisted "that the education of the people ought to be free."

---

(1) Pakington himself was not opposed to the principle of compulsion but believed that its inclusion at this point would severely weaken the Bill's chance of success. Hansard, CXXXVII, 658, 16 March 1855.

(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/46, Haly to Pakington, 11 January 1855.

Though there were three major Education Bills [1] before the Commons in 1855, those of Russell, Pakington and Milner Gibson, Pakington's measure, the Education (No. 2) Bill, was the only one to receive serious consideration. Whilst Pakington's scheme ran to sixty-three clauses, Milner Gibson's was drawn in twenty-seven, and Russell's in a mere twenty-two. The most interesting detail of Milner Gibson's Free Schools Bill was its delineation of four types of school, infant schools for those under six, day schools for six and upwards, evening schools for those aged ten and above, and industrial schools "for such young poor persons as may appear to have no Means of Subsistence except by Begging or Crime." Two important details of Pakington's Bill which neither appeared in the original Outline, nor featured prominently in the parliamentary debates were Clause XXXVII which sought to secure qualified teachers for the schools in union and to guarantee them augmentation of salary under the Committee of Council minutes, and Clause XXIV which prescribed for schools for children aged six and over a curriculum including, "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, English Grammar, English History, and the Elements of Geography; and in the Case of a Girls School, plain Needlework."

Russell's Bill was introduced without explanation on 8 February [2] and ordered to be brought in by Russell and his nephew, Mr. Hastings Russell. [3] Milner Gibson's Free Schools Bill had a first reading on 29 March [4] but

---

(1) P.P. 1854-5, ii, 235, A Bill to promote Education in England; ibid., 245, A Bill for the better encouragement and promotion of Education in England (No. 2); ibid., 461, A Bill to establish Free Schools in England and Wales.
(2) Hansard, CXXXVI, 1378-9, 8 February 1855.
(3) A Whig, M.P. for Bedfordshire, and a supporter of "a really national system of education".
(4) Brought in by Milner Gibson, Cobden and T.E. Headlam, Liberal M.P. for Newcastle upon Tyne.

that occupied only three columns of Hansard, [1] and thereafter Russell and Milner Gibson left the field clear for Pakington, refrained from pressing their own Bills to a second reading, and thankfully abandoned them on 2 July when the Education (No. 2) Bill was withdrawn. [2] Milner Gibson was in broad agreement with Pakington on the issue of rate-supported free schools and differed on the matter of the state restricting itself to the provision of secular education simply because he believed that this was the only way to circumvent the religious difficulties. His introduction of a Bill was partly to release him from the necessity of having to introduce amendments to Pakington's own. In Russell's scheme, where the local authorities were to submit educational plans to the Privy Council, another major point of difference, that initiative in securing a rate was to be in the hands of the town councils and vestries themselves, had indeed had a place in Pakington's own early formulations.

Much depended upon Pakington's presentation of his Bill, and he decided to make his major explanatory statement upon the first reading. On the evening of Wednesday, 14 March Pakington's dinner guests included Stanley, Lytton and the Adderleys, and on Friday [3] 16th Pakington introduced his Bill [4] in a speech [5] of some two-and-three-quarter hours. Though some would initially see the Bill as an official Conservative measure,

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 1370-2, 29 March 1855.
(2) Hansard, CXXXIX, 388, 2 July 1855.
(3) Fridays were normally devoted to government business.
(4) The names of Pakington, Lytton and Adderley were on the back of the Bill.
(5) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/7, Diary, 14 and 16 March 1855. Hansard, CXXXVII, 640-72, 16 March 1855. The speech was separately printed. J.S. Pakington, Speech in the House of Commons on March 16, 1855 on moving for leave to introduce a Bill for the better promotion of National Education (1855).

Pakington clearly took his stance as "an independent Member of this House". (1) He assured his listeners that he sought no party advantage or triumph. "On the contrary, I believe this subject will never be settled by the struggles of contending political parties, and it is my anxious desire to combine men of all opinions in the endeavour to solve this great question." (2)

Probably the most important parts of his speech, both in the context of the immediate debate, and in the light of current controversies, were the sections devoted to proving that the supply of elementary education was deficient both in quantity and quality. (3) On quantity Pakington argued that although in 1817 the number of children at school as a percentage of the total population was 1 in 17, in 1833 1 in 11, and in 1851 1 in 8¼, this had not been a uniform advance. Indeed in some areas the position had worsened. "In Liverpool, in 1833 the proportion of children attending school was 1 in 7 and a fraction, while in 1851 it was 1 in 8 and a fraction; so that the state of education in Liverpool has positively retrograded, and that is also the case with regard to York." (4) In contrast he claimed the proportions in other countries were, 1 in 4 in several Swiss cantons, 1 in 5 in Saxony, 1 in 5 in parts of the U.S.A., and 1 in 6 in Prussia. Pakington's skilful evaluation of the 1851 census figures avoided the

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 640, 16 March 1855.
(2) Ibid., 658.
(3) Quantity and quality include such contentious issues as attendance and literacy. Full titles are given in the Bibliography of those works by Ball (1973), Ellis(1973), Hurt (1971), Leinster-Mackay (1976), McCann (1969), Rubinstein (1969), Smith (1969-70), West (1965, 1970, 1971, 1975), and Wrigley (1972), which have been particularly useful for this thesis.
(4) Hansard, CXXXVII, 648, 16 March 1855.

worst dangers of exaggeration, but still managed to show a considerable deficiency. Of the 4,908,696 children aged between 3 and 15, 2,144,378 were at school. Mann's estimates of 200,000 suffering from illness and 50,000 educated at home he allowed, but he cast doubt on the estimate of a million at work, for the number actually so returned was about 600,000, whilst he refused entirely to allow that children should be allowed to work before they had been educated. Pakington accepted that children of the labouring classes below the age of 5 and above the age of 12 might reasonably be deducted, but even this calculation, after allowing for Mann's earlier deductions left 968,557 children between the ages of 5 and 12 who were not at school. In concluding this point, however, Pakington cunningly returned to the 3-15 age range when estimating "that 41 and a fraction per cent are at school, only 12 and a fraction are at work, and 46 and a fraction per cent are neither at school nor at work." (1) In eight London parishes with a total population of 662,694 Pakington calculated, by applying the ratio of 1 in 6, that 47,532 children received no education at all. This situation he attributed partly to the poverty and indifference of the parents, and partly to the manner in which the parliamentary grants were distributed. Pakington showed that since 1839 four wealthy metropolitan parishes, St. Michael Chester Square, St. Barnabas, Kentish Town and Kensington, with a combined population of some 50,000 had received £3,908. On the other hand the 138,900 inhabitants of the poor parishes of Clerkenwell, St. Giles, Shoreditch and Shadwell had over the same period received but £12. Os. 8d. (2)

The argument of quality reinforced that of quantity.

---

(1) Ibid., 649.
(2) Ibid., 646.

Mann's report showed that of the 44,800 schools in England and Wales whilst 98% taught reading, only 68% taught writing, 61% arithmetic, and only 2% industrial occupation. Pakington contrasted this with the full curricula of schools in continental Europe and specifically quoted the examples of Prussia, Switzerland and France. In the last-named, under Guizot's statute of 25 April 1834, instruction in elementary schools included: 1, moral and religious instruction; 2, reading; 3, writing; 4, the elements of arithmetic; 5, the elements of the French language; 6, the legal system of weights and measures; 7, geography, particularly of France; 8, history, particularly of France; 9, linear drawing; and 10, singing. (1) In contrast, of the 29,425 private schools in England, only 4,956 had been classified by Mann as superior, whilst at the other end of the scale 708 of the replies with the returns had been signed by the schoolteachers with a mark! Pakington took examples from the army and the prisons to show that, whatever construction might be placed upon the statistics of school provision large sectors of the adult population were illiterate. H.M.I. Mitchell had obtained a return from colonels of militia in the eastern counties which showed that of 5,677 men only 2,051 could write their names. Reverend J. Clay had reported in 1849 that of 1949 persons committed to Preston gaol nearly 50% were unable to read, 61% were ignorant of the name of the Queen, and that 67% were unable to name the months of the year.

Pakington went on to develop the argument that a high incidence of crime could be directly related to the want of education. He was unwise to do so for four reasons. Firstly the success or failure of his Bill would depend

---

(1) For a background to this comparison see F.C. Green, A Comparative View of French and British Civilization, 1850-1870 (1965).

largely upon the unimpeachable nature of his evidence and the irrefutable character of his arguments. Secondly there was no accepted means of proving that ignorance begat crime. Thirdly that Pakington was careless in his use of statistics, and finally that in choosing Austria, a largely Catholic empire, for his comparison, he would be bound to excite Protestant suspicions within the House. His treatment of this particular point was short, a mere paragraph, less than a full column (1) in Hansard, but it was the most fragile link in his chain of argument. He stated rather than proved the superiority of Austrian educational provision over that of England, but the two crucial sentences which left him open to counter attack were these; "I find that in 1846, when the population of England was 17,018,600, the number of persons committed for trial was 25,107, and the number summarily convicted was 35,749, making altogether 60,856 persons convicted of crime. The population of Austria in 1838 was 23,652,000, and the detected crimes amounted to 29,492." (2)

Pakington then proceeded to outline the main provisions of his Bill. Popularly-elected local education boards, free schooling, non-interference with existing schools, religious teaching with perfect toleration, were principles upon which he laid particular emphasis. In retrospect, however, it is noticeable that two other sections of his speech not specifically concerned with the Bill led to more immediate results, those he devoted to criticism of the existing Privy Council system and the need for a proper department, his concern that so many pupil teachers never became full members of the profession, and the need for "the means of Parliamentary inquiry into these matters." (3)

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 653-4, 16 March 1855.
(2) A very unsatisfactory basis for comparison.
(3) Ibid., 645.

Pakington's conclusions were not in general to be shared by the Commons in 1855. They did not agree that "We cannot go on as we are. The voluntary system had broken down ... the only legitimate mode in which you can provide education for the people is by calling upon the people to contribute a rate for it." (1) The House was not sufficiently moved by his oratory to complement the page in the Statute Book which declared that no man should be destitute by one "which should say that no man shall be ignorant." (2) His peroration, indeed, which eschewed such rhetoric was cautious and correct. "That Bill may, and probably will be, unsuccessful; but I feel a deep conviction that year by year the momentous nature of this question will become more apparent, and that ere long it must be settled upon principles similar to those which I have ventured to explain. Sir, I am willing to incur the risk of failure in a cause which I believe to be so important ... I can only say that it will always remain to me a matter of satisfaction that I have endeavoured to make some contribution to a cause upon which I most conscientiously believe that the character and future welfare of this country essentially depend." (3)

Four major responses emerged from the eight speakers who followed Pakington that evening. Stanley (4) and Adderley (5) naturally gave support, but unfortunately they differed over the best method of proceeding. Stanley saw little difference in principle between the Bills of Pakington and Russell and advocated that they should both be referred to the same Committee, their proposals be amalgamated, and thus "meet with the concurrence of a large majority both in this House and in the country." (6)

---

(1) Ibid., 661.
(2) Ibid., 659.
(3) Ibid., 672.
(4) Ibid., 673-8.
(5) Ibid., 693-7.
(6) Ibid., 678.

Adderley, having referred to the importance of industrial training for the poorer classes, one of his own particular interests, went on to emphasize the superiority of Pakington's Bill over that of Russell, which he maintained "had been crudely drawn and precipitately introduced." (1) Lord Robert Cecil (2) and Hadfield, (3) Liberal member for Sheffield, spoke for the denominational cause. Cecil saw the Bill as "the secular system in disguise", (4) and concluded that it would produce "a nation of infidels". (5) Hadfield criticized Pakington's omission of the contribution of Sunday schools, and declared "that voluntary efforts, properly regulated, were sufficient to provide for the educational wants of the country." (6)

Fox (7) and Milner Gibson (8) spoke for the secular party. Fox gave a general welcome to the Bill, supported Pakington's analysis of the ineffectiveness of educational provision, and promised the Bill "fair and grateful consideration". (9) He held out the prospect of some reconciliation. "The friends of national education must, however, endeavour to approximate as closely as they could, and agree to forego objects impracticable in the present state of society, in order to combine in the great work of elevating the poorer classes from their degraded condition." (10) Even Milner Gibson, with whom Pakington had clashed sharply since 1854 over the

---

(1) Ibid., 693.
(2) Ibid., 684-6. Robert Arthur Talbot Gascoyne Cecil, third Marquess of Salisbury (1830-1903). He succeeded his brother as Viscount Cranborne in 1865, and to his father's title in 1868. Conservative M.P. for Stamford, 1853-68. In 1869 he succeeded Derby as Chancellor of Oxford University.
(3) Ibid., 672-3.
(4) Ibid., 685.
(5) Ibid., 686.
(6) Ibid., 673.
(7) Ibid., 686-90.
(8) Ibid., 690-3.
(9) Ibid., 690.
(10) Ibid., 686.

rejection of the Manchester and Salford Bill, now spoke in complimentary terms. He saw Pakington's Bill as "a considerable step towards establishing a free system of national education." (1) Though he declared his intention of bringing in a bill on behalf of the secular party, his stated purpose in laying it before the House would be to seek some means of agreement between two of the three education parties. Milner Gibson advised that, "The two which he thought most likely to unite, were the party of the right hon. Baronet opposite and the secular party," (2) and that such a combination could overcome the resistance of extreme denominationalism or voluntaryism.

In spite of the existence of Russell's Bill, Grey (3) and Palmerston (4) for the Government also welcomed Pakington's proposals. Grey agreed that the voluntary system had failed to cope with the deficiencies in education, advised that there was no need to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, and even urged the need for a compulsory system. Palmerston, the last speaker, was defensive on two points, he regretted Adderley's criticisms of Russell's Bill and questioned Pakington's conclusions as to the extent of ignorance and crime in the country, but he too was generally complimentary, and praised Pakington's "very interesting and able speech". (5)

Thus representatives of two of the potentially hostile groups had shown themselves willing to give serious consideration to the Bill. The Government, in spite of the existence of Russell's Bill, would not oppose it on purely political grounds, the Secularists, in spite of their own Free Schools Bill would not oppose it for purely doctrinal reasons. Ironically, but predictably, the opposition to Pakington's Bill was led by Conservatives,

---

(1) Ibid., 690.
(2) Ibid., 691.
(3) Ibid., 678-84.
(4) Ibid., 697-9.
(5) Ibid., 697.

including his former Cabinet colleagues, and by members of the Anglican Church, including both supporters of the National Society and of the Church Education Society.

Initial response in the newspapers to Pakington's proposals was very encouraging, and Henry Kingscote [1] noted that "the press of every party ... has approved of them with a unanimity which I never before remember to have observed on so great a public question." [2] But opposition was soon voiced from within the Anglican church both by Tractarian and Evangelical leaders. Denison and Colquhoun found themselves on the same side. History has shown that their fears were justified, and that their predictions would be fulfilled. In the first place the development of rate-supported educational facilities has led to a significant decline in the numbers of voluntary schools, in the second, perfect toleration in religious matters has been accompanied by colourless Christianity and widespread secularism.

On the Evangelical side Ashley recorded in his diary his regret at being divided from Pakington over the issue of rate aid. "I dread, sadly dread, these schemes of national education. Pakington, who is a good man and a sensible one, has taken the lead in a scheme for local rates to maintain the education of the people. Such a plan is a death warrant to the teaching of Evangelical religion. It had better be called a water rate to extinguish religious fire among the people." [3] Francis Close saw Pakington's Bill as "the death knell of our

---

(1) Henry Robert Kingscote (1802-1882), a philanthropist and cricketer. President of the M.C.C. A narrow escape from drowning turned his attention to religious matters. He helped to found the Southwark fund for schools and churches, and was founder of the National Orphan Asylum at Ham Common.

(2) H. Kingscote, Sir John Pakington's plan. A reply to the "Remarks" of J.C. Colquhoun (1855), 20. A leader in The Standard, 17 March 1855, for example, commended Pakington's "sincere piety, anxious care, great wisdom, and great experience ...."

(3) J.L. and B. Hammond, Lord Shaftesbury (1923),257.

existing schools," (1) within five years, he argued, these would either become extinct or fall into government hands. Close rejected the idea of popularly-elected education boards. Whilst bodies of this nature might adequately supervise such matters as workhouse diets, etc., they would be quite unsuitable for the intellectual and spiritual responsibilities entailed in supervising the moral and religious training of the children of the lower classes, in directing the course of studies, and in determining the boundaries of religious and secular education. Close concluded that the heterogeneous character of the population precluded the possibility of general legislation.

The major broadside, however, was fired by J.C. Colquhoun. He too, like Ashley, had formerly countenanced the idea of an educational rate. Two years earlier, in a letter addressed to the Committee and members of the National Club, Colquhoun, though insisting on the need to retain existing school committees connected with religious bodies, and on the requirement "that all new school committees shall be formed out of the same agency," (2) had stated that "the first function, then, of the Parish Education Committee would be to levy a rate." (3) Now in 1855 Colquhoun addressed a letter (4) to Walpole which called on the Conservative party to do its duty by the Church. Conservative leaders were well aware of the dangers. On 17 April, two days before Colquhoun's letter, Derby wrote anxiously to Disraeli, "I want particularly to

---

(1) F. Close, A few more words on Education Bills(1856), 9.
(2) J.C. Colquhoun, On the Measures to be now taken in order to secure a good National Education (1853), 10.
(3) Ibid., 12.
(4) J.C. Colquhoun, Remarks on Sir John Pakington's Education Bill. In a letter to the Right Hon. S.H. Walpole M.P. (1855).

consult with you with reference to two rocks ahead - Maynooth and Pakington's Bill." (1) Derby intended, after a preliminary meeting with Disraeli, to have a small conference including Pakington and Walpole. Colquhoun urged on Walpole that Pakington's proposals would mean the cessation of voluntary subscriptions and school pence, and would bring to an end a system which, whatever its limitations, had served the country well. Pakington's Bill, he maintained, was characterized by an "inefficiency and mischief" which would destroy existing schools. He concluded, "Interpose, I intreat you, and arrest this Bill. I do not wonder that the Secularists hail it; it is welcome to all who defy the religious sentiment of the people of England." (2)

Evangelical appeals were also addressed to the Whig Government. Reverend Richard Burgess B.D., Rector of Upper Chelsea, Prebendary of St Paul's, and a Committee member of the Church Education Society, wrote on 13 April to Sir George Grey the Home Secretary. Burgess claimed that the provision of a further 400,000 school places was all that was necessary to secure national education, and that "if £500,000 additional were put into the hands of the Committee of Council, we should, after a very few years, see our means of Education, both in quantity and quality adequate to our wants." (3) Burgess wanted the Committee of Council to engage in the task which was eventually carried out under the 1870 Act, namely "to ascertain where schools for the poor are wanted, to offer liberal grants to managers who may be

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/S/135, Derby to Disraeli, 17 April 1855.
(2) J.C. Colquhoun, Remarks on Sir John Pakington's Education Bill. In a letter to the Right Hon. S.H. Walpole M.P. (1855), 22.
(3) R. Burgess, National Education, by Rates or Taxes. A letter addressed to the Right Honourable Sir George Grey, Bart., Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department. (1855), 10.

able to meet them, and where no such are to be found, there to build the School-houses entirely out of the public money, and to support them as Government free schools." (1) He rejected the necessity for "any gigantic scheme for a National Education", deplored Pakington's Bill as the first instalment of "Obligatory rates, free schools, and compulsory attendance", (2) and concluded by calling on the Government to adhere to the present system. His letter was prefaced by, and concluded with a quotation from Russell's Commons speech of 4 April 1853. "Rather let us strengthen and improve the system of Education which has grown up, chiefly by voluntary efforts, than attempt to set up anything in its place which, while it disturbs the existing system, might fail in supplying in its place by anything like an equal sum, for the support of the instruction of the poor." (3)

Burgess took great care not to attack Pakington personally in his pamphlet, and even Colquhoun paid tribute to Pakington's philanthropy. J.C. Miller who wrote on 14 April from St Martin's rectory, Birmingham, and whose criticism, at the annual meeting of the Church Education Society on 24 April, of Pakington's proposals has been referred to in the previous chapter, in his Which? or Neither? An examination of the Education Bills of Lord John Russell and Sir John S. Pakington (4) conducted one of the most objective analyses of the Bill from the Evangelical standpoint. Miller argued for compulsory schooling, against too much free education,

---

(1) Ibid., 11.
(2) Ibid., 12.
(3) Ibid., 15-16.
(4) J.C. Miller, Which? or Neither? An examination of the Education Bills of Lord J. Russell and Sir J.S. Pakington (1855). This forty-five page pamphlet was based upon material which had previously appeared in the Birmingham Journal over the signature 'Sybil'.

and gave strong support to the principle of religious liberty. Miller's experience in Birmingham convinced him that "For National Education, we must have a principle which will plant our schools - and that first - in the most destitute and helpless districts, where local resources are nil. And a principle, too which will proportion its aid to the actual necessities of the district aided." (1) He ended with words of praise and encouragement for both Pakington and Russell, having urged that the solution to the "Educational crisis ... cannot be long delayed." (2)

Henry Kingscote took upon himself the responsibility of countering the effects of Colquhoun's pamphlet. (3) He showed the illogicalities in the arguments of Colquhoun over the issues of religious teaching and compulsion, and the inconsistency between Colquhoun's pamphlet and the second annual report of the Church Education Society, two documents which had appeared in the same week. In the former Colquhoun argued that the voluntary system of education in England produced a higher proportion of children in school than in countries with compulsory education, whilst the latter showed the considerable extent of educational deficiencies. On compulsion Kingscote noted Colquhoun's conclusion that Pakington's Bill would fail because it was not compulsory, and yet he had also argued that the compulsory system in Germany failed to bring as large a proportion of the children to school as did the voluntary system in England. Even more telling perhaps on a personal level was Kingscote's warning to Colquhoun that he was now "arm in arm with Archdeacon Denison! " (4)

---

(1) Ibid., 11.
(2) Ibid., 9.
(3) H. Kingscote, Sir John Pakington's plan. A reply to the "Remarks" of J.C. Colquhoun (1855), a twenty-two page pamphlet.
(4) Ibid., 4.

Reactions from the High Church party were predictable. Derwent Coleridge, Principal of St Mark's, an institution viewed with suspicion by many in the Anglican church, objected to Pakington's statement that many students from the training colleges betook themselves to holy orders or other professions. Of 230 schoolmasters educated at St Mark's only twelve had taken holy orders, and in all but one case in connection with educational appointments. Coleridge admitted that many pupil teachers went on to become clerks or followed other employment not connected with tuition, but "these have done the work for which they were engaged, and for which they have been by no means over-paid." (1) Denison's opposition was less restrained. He had spent the vesper hours of Easter eve in his sanctuary at East Brent in penning an inflammatory epistle, but as Kingscote observed, of the five propositions upon which he took issue with Pakington's Bill, on four he was "altogether completely misinformed". (2) The Bills of Pakington and Milner Gibson were considered by the Committee of the National Society on 2 May. (3) The Committee 's objections to Pakington's Bill centred on the argument that it would threaten the trust deeds of many Anglican schools, and impede the progress of religious education by making unnecessary alterations to the existing system. (4) The Society also presented a petition against Russell's Bill. On 1 May, however, the Educational Expositor, journal of the United Association of Schoolmasters of Great Britain, a body which numbered Bromby of Cheltenham and Unwin of Homerton amongst its Vice-Presidents, examined

---

(1) Coleridge to Pakington, 22 March 1855, Pakington to Coleridge, 24 March 1855. The correspondence is printed in the Monthly Paper of the National Society, April 1855, 74-5.

(2) Kingscote, op. cit., 4. G.A. Denison, Notes of My Life 1805-78 (1878), 267-73, gives a summary of the education debate 1855-6, and draws particular attention to the part played by Henley, Denison's father-in-law.

(3) N.S.R.O. National Society General Committee Minute Book, V, 433, 2 May 1855, the very day of the second reading of Pakington's Bill.

(4) N.S.R.O. Annual Report of the National Society, 6 June 1855.

all three bills. It concluded that "Sir John Pakington's seems to be the one which meets with the most extensive and cordial approach on the part of the public and is probably destined, with some slight modifications, to become the law of the land." (1)

Pakington, who had left a Sebastopol Committee meeting to be present in the House, moved the second reading of his Bill in a short speech on 2 May. (2) He reaffirmed his belief in the five principles on which his measure was based; that the existing means of education must be extended and improved, that this extended and improved education must be religious, that religious education must be based upon perfect toleration, that finance must be provided by parliamentary grants and local contributions, and finally that such funds must be administered by popularly-elected local boards. He also paid a fulsome tribute to the Dissenters who had "stepped in to the rescue, and trained many thousands of our population to the knowledge of their religious duties, of which the inadequate supply of Church instruction had left them utterly ignorant." (3) He was followed by Henley who moved the amendment that the Bill be read six months hence in a mammoth speech (4) of some three-and-a-quarter hours, a speech which not only destroyed Pakington's Bill but exerted its influence on the education debate for years to come.

Henley began by characterizing Pakington as "a dear and valued friend" (5) but one who was in error in supposing that his Bill could "bring a good and extended religious education within the reach of every door." (6)

---

(1) Educational Expositor, 1 May 1855, 149-50. See Laaden Fletcher, 'The Development of Periodicals addressed to Teachers in Britain before 1870', Journal of Educational Administration and History, II (2), 1970, for a useful summary of such journals.
(2) Hansard, CXXXVII, 2112-17, 2 May 1855.
(3) Ibid., 2115.
(4) Ibid., 2117-51.
(5) Ibid., 2117.
(6) Ibid., 2118.

He contended that the Bill would do nothing to "increase the numbers of scholars, nor the quality of the education imparted." (1) His arguments on these two key points, however, were few in number and generally unconvincing. But Henley swiftly passed to the more emotive issues which formed the basis of his speech. In a time of war he shrewdly concentrated his arguments upon a patriotic appeal to the superiority of English character, institutions and Protestant morality. These were skilfully contrasted with the Catholicism, immorality and crime of Austria, with the secular radicalism of the U.S.A., with the European revolutions of 1848, with régimes which were maintained by heavy taxation and the bayonet point. He concluded that to tamper with, or overthrow the existing system of day and Sunday schools which had produced this happy state of affairs, as he asserted Pakington's Bill would do, would be an act not of national education but of national folly.

Henley began with Austria, and indeed put so much effort into refuting Pakington's admittedly unsatisfactory evidence on this subject that he arrived at a similar conclusion. For whereas Pakington had argued that the greater educational provision of Austria was reflected in a lower incidence of crime, Henley sought to demonstrate that England had both more education and less crime. He quickly further confused the issue, however, by entering into statistics of crime and illegitimacy in the various provinces of the Austrian Empire, and concluded "that in that portion of Austria where education is the most extensively diffused, the moral and criminal condition of the people appears to be the worst." (2) Henley extracted the very fullest value from the issue of the uncertain connection between education and crime. His reference to the incidence of crime in English counties showed, for

---

(1) Ibid., 2120.
(2) Ibid., 2129.

example, that whilst Lancashire and Middlesex both had an educational ratio of 1 in 10.6, the crime rate of the former was 1 in 586 persons and of the latter only 1 in 913. From Catholicism, crime and illegitimacy, Henley turned to the secularism and sad decline of the Puritan commonwealths of the U.S.A. He quoted tellingly from Baines' evidence to the Manchester and Salford Education Committee to show how Mann's tenth report on the schools of Massachusetts concluded, "that there is almost no religious instruction given in the day schools of the United States at all." (1)

The superiority of the English educational system, of English character, of English institutions was then displayed. That educational system was steadily growing. In 1851 it claimed 2,140,000 pupils in day, and 2,400,000 in Sunday, schools, and Henley contended that within ten or twelve years all the deficiencies would be supplied. Crime, drunkeness and bastardy were in steady decline, and the institutions of the country had never been more secure. He stood firmly by the "effect of our system of education on the people, producing as it does a sense of responsibility, self-government, and social order." (2) The patience of the civilian population during the distress of the 1840's, the fortitude of the army in the Crimea, were contrasted with "what took place in the streets of Vienna and Berlin, and in the streets of many of the other towns of Germany, in and after 1848." (3) Yet Pakington would overthrow, at a probable cost of some £5 million per annum, the educational system which had produced such benefits! For Henley concluded, as he had begun, by declaring "that it is utterly impossible for rate-supported schools and voluntary schools to co-exist." (4)

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 2131, 2 May 1855.
(2) Ibid., 2137.
(3) Ibid., 2138.
(4) Ibid., 2146.

He quoted Kay-Shuttleworth's opinion of 1853, "It would be difficult to conceive that any man of Parliamentary experience could gravely propose that local municipal boards should be invested with power to establish rate-supported schools in every parish, with whatever constitution, to the inevitable destruction of the schools of religious communions." (1) If Pakington's Bill became law the next generation might well find that "instead of having had an educational system based on sound religious principles - such as that which has raised the character of the people of this country so high, we have delivered to them a system which, like that of America, though intended to be religious, has become secular." (2)

The amendment was seconded by Phillimore, and Miles then strove desperately to reverse the impression created by Henley's speech. He declared Henley's deductions to be "essentially fallacious". The voluntary system was inadequate, the Bill was necessary, and would promote religious education. Dillwyn spoke for the amendment, Byng in opposition, and Adderley, with the support of Pakington moved the adjournment. Though Russell had remained in the House for a considerable time he did not speak, and Government ministers in general had been absent at a Cabinet meeting.

Pakington declared that he would refute Henley's arguments at the earliest possible opportunity, that evening he dined with the Adderleys and doubtless discussed the prospects of an early resumption of the debate. But when on the following day, 3 May, he asked Palmerston to be "good enough to fix an early day for resuming the adjourned debate," the Prime Minister replied that he had reluctantly decided, after consultation with Sir George Cornewall Lewis the Chancellor of the

---

(1) Ibid., 2147.
(2) Ibid., 2150-1.

Exchequer, that urgent matters connected with Supply made it impossible to grant a Government day until after Whitsun. (1) Various suggestions were made for expediting the Bill's progress. Russell had offered to hold back his own Bill until the second reading of Pakington's had been completed, Milner Gibson advised that the three Bills should be read pro forma and referred to a Select Committee. Evelyn Denison suggested that time could be created by making further use of morning sessions. But Pakington received no support from his Conservative colleagues. Indeed it is probable that their influence was exerted to secure the post-ponement of the resumption. Pakington recorded in his diary "... H. of C. appealed to Govt. for day for adjd. debate. - Govt. willing but want supply - supply in morning suggested but Disraeli and Walpole dissented privately - long after Whitsuntide offered." (2)

The Times, which had earlier welcomed Pakington's Bill, now concluded that after Henley's speech Pakington would probably abandon his measure, though it was suggested that it was "... incumbent upon MR HENLEY to follow up his present success with some definite proposition of his own." (3) The delay between the first and second readings had, as The Times observed, given Henley the opportunity of "sifting the statistics", and producing his major speech. As Pakington realised and Russell confirmed, a swift refutation of Henley's arguments was now essential. Instead the six weeks interval between 2 May and the resumption of the debate on 11 June was almost as effective a death blow as the six months delay proposed by the amendment. In the interval Pakington pursued his accustomed political and

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 32, 3 May 1855.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/7, Diary, 3 May 1855.
(3) The Times, 3 May 1855.

social round, with the work of the Sebastopol Committee commanding particular attention. He also made diligent preparations against the resumption of the debate, and his consultations included a discussion with Kay-Shuttleworth on 19 May. On 11 June, a week after Parliament had reassembled, the debate on the second reading was resumed.

Pakington's worst fears were now realised. Adderley who led off, (1) and whose name was on the back of the Bill, was at his most muddled and incompetent. He overpraised Henley's speech, and then proceeded totally to undermine Pakington's position by stating that the clauses which provided for new schools "were incongruous in principle with the rest of the measure. This supplement was unnecessary because the zeal of religious bodies will never leave unsupplied the supposed deficiency." (2) He asked Pakington to expunge these clauses, and thus make the Bill virtually identical with the Manchester and Salford Bill which he, Adderley, had introduced in 1854. The damage was done. As Lord John Manners observed, (3) if Adderley, a promoter of the Bill, could declare that half of it lacked his support and the other half was unnecessary, then indeed Henley, "in his great oration on this subject, had driven his right hon. Friend (Sir J. Pakington) from the field." (4) Manners was now confident enough that no progress would be made in 1855 to state that, if forced, he would choose Milner Gibson's of the three Bills, for at least he knew precisely what that would entail. In 1870 the threat of the compulsory, free, secular programme of the National Education League would discipline the Conservatives into voting for Forster's Bill. Fox, in

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1784-93, 11 June 1855.
(2) Ibid., 1786.
(3) Ibid., 1793-8.
(4) Ibid., 1794.

a judicious speech (1) which looked forward to the arguments of the 1860's, showed the need for a basic education for all, both as an end in itself and as a necessary preliminary for further studies, and made a particular link with the extension of the franchise, arguing that it would not be unwise, "if the enlargement of the suffrage were made conditional on the attainment of a certain quantum of education." (2)

Pakington began his own speech (3) fully conscious of the responsibility which rested upon his shoulders. In the event he was unequal to the task. He recorded in his diary "... I spoke in reply to Henley, and made good speech - but not with usual success. I read too much." (4) His comment here referred to his attempt to refute Henley's argument by reading from letters and reports. This was in some ways a tactical mistake, though whether any other course was open to him is doubtful. As Pakington rightly claimed Henley had "either omitted or had evaded all the strongest points on which he (Sir John Pakington) had justified the introduction of his Bill." (5) Henley had expressed the nation's confidence in itself, the spirit of 1851 and the Exhibition, and had included education in that expression. The figures of the report of the Newcastle Commission would confirm the view that the voluntary system, backed by Privy Council grants, could provide an education for the nation. It needed the Hyde Park incident and the second Reform Act, the Paris exhibition and Forster's interpretation of the

---

(1) Ibid., 1798-1805.
(2) Ibid., 1804.
(3) Ibid., 1805-28.
(4) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/7, Diary, 11 June 1855.
(5) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1806, 11 June 1855.

figures of the four towns inquiry [1] to suggest that that confidence should be interpreted, at least as far as education was concerned, as complacency. Pakington's careful, accurate and painstaking speech was thus in one sense inappropriate. He admitted his error over the comparison of crime figures between Austria and England, and showed the mistakes in Henley's own statistics on this point. He read in full a long letter from H.M.I. Joshua Ruddock, [2] on the educational deficiencies of children admitted to workhouses, and another from H.M.I. Mitchell [3] which advised that in agricultural districts little educational progress could be expected under the present system in the next ten years. He quoted from a report on prisoners in Sussex, at length from a letter from Ellis a clergyman of Burslem who concluded, "having read Mr Henley's speech, which greatly surprised me, I wished to show you the practical inefficiency of voluntary efforts as illustrated in my own case," [4] from a report of H.M.I. Kennedy and the writings of Dr Hook of Leeds. Such extracts showed the extent of educational deficiency and the need for a rate. Pakington's next important quotation was from a letter he had received from Kay-Shuttleworth which deplored Henley's quotation from Public Education, which had been taken completely out of context. Kay-Shuttleworth hoped "that the discussions on the Education Bills now before Parliament, will establish the expediency of raising the schools of the religious communions to a state of complete efficiency by the aid of a public rate." [5] In conclusion Pakington apologised for having "wearied the House by entering into so much detail," and took up briefly Fox's point about franchise

---

(1) P.P. 1870, liv, 265, Return, confined to the Municipal Boroughs of Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester, of all Schools for the Poorer Classes of Children ....
(2) Ruddock to Pakington, 3 May 1855.
(3) Mitchell to Pakington, 7 June 1855, a reply to Pakington's letter of 5 June.
(4) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1818, 11 June 1855.
(5) Ibid., 1816.

extension and the dangers of "democratic institutions among an ignorant people." (1) The debate was further adjourned, and later readjourned.

Finally on 2 July Pakington bowed to the inevitable and with a short speech (2) gave up his Bill. (3) He asked the House early next session to settle the issue upon his principles, namely, the continuation of existing schools, the supplying of deficiencies from a public fund administered by elected local bodies, and the retention of the religious element in education, though combined with perfect toleration. He restated his firm conviction, "that in the quality of the teaching and in the numbers taught the majority of the States of Europe and America were in advance of this country." (4) Pakington spoke briefly in the Supply debate on education on 26 July, and that same day called on Haly and Kingscote to discuss the education issue, but his thoughts were now turning towards Westwood, and by August he was fully engaged in Worcestershire summer pursuits.

Reasons are easily found to explain the failure of Pakington's Bill of 1855. His preliminary soundings revealed the divisions which existed amongst denominationalists, and between them and the secularists. Few within Parliament or without gave him wholehearted support. His own political party stood aloof, and its leaders in the Commons, Disraeli and Walpole indirectly, and Henley and Manners openly, exerted their influence against the Bill. Adderley acted the role of renegade. Though the Whig Government was not actively hostile, and Russell and Milner Gibson left the field clear, Pakington's

---

(1) Ibid., 1827.
(2) Hansard, CXXXIX, 383-5, 2 July 1855.
(3) The Bills of Russell and Milner Gibson were also withdrawn at this juncture.
(4) Hansard, CXXXIX, 384, 2 July 1855.

difficulty in securing consecutive parliamentary time was shown on the second reading when on 2 July he was faced with the prospect of continuing a debate which had begun as far back as 2 May. Though Pakington's speeches on the first and second reading were impressive the debates overall were dominated by Henley's contribution. His speech achieved considerable prominence. (1) Its mood accurately reflected the temper of a country about to win a war. (2) Pakington's insistence on the superiority of foreign educational systems was, even if accurate, tactically unwise.

But it must be admitted that even without these particular problems Pakington's Bill stood little chance of success. The religious, social and political connotations of the education issue still seemed to render it insuperable. Whig experience in 1833 and 1839, the controversy over Graham's proposals of 1843, the failure of the Manchester Bills in the early 1850's, showed the dimensions of the problem. Pakington's successes with his earlier private Bills were of little relevance in this particular context. It was still generally believed that the voluntary system, backed by generous grants in aid, would eventually provide all the education that could reasonably be required. To destroy that system and to recreate it in some foreign mould was unacceptable. In 1855 only a national or international catastrophe; economic disaster, internal revolution, humiliating naval or military defeat - the loss perhaps of the war, could have produced an act for national education. But Pakington's Bill was not completely in vain. The 1870 Act was not precipitated by a national

---

(1) It was separately printed. J.W. Henley, Education Speech ... in the House of Commons ... May the 3rd (1855) on moving that the Bill for the better promoting National Education be read this day six months (1855).

(2) The American Civil War and the Prussian wars would influence the education debate of the 1860's.

catastrophe but by a political reaction to distinct religious, social and constitutional developments. The situation had by then changed. Baines and the extreme Voluntaryists had admitted defeat, and most sections of the Anglican church, the Conservatives and the House of Lords were sufficiently apprehensive of the programme of the League to throw in their lot with the Liberal Bill. The Paris exhibition had cast doubts on the quality of English technical skill, the Prussian war machine on the wisdom of relying overmuch on the bovine stubbornness of English militia men and regiments of the line. The franchise had been extended. There was an Education Department with a representative in the House of Commons, and the contending Manchester educational groups had been united. These two latter developments which took place in 1856 were a direct outcome of Pakington's Bill of 1855.

Chapter Four

THE YEAR OF SUCCESS, 1856

In 1852 Pakington had had personal experience of the unsatisfactory nature of the Committee of Privy Council on Education, and thereafter one of the essential themes in his plan for national education was that it should be organized as a separate department of state with a responsible minister at its head. In 1855 he wisely kept the issue of an Education department distinct from his Bill, and in this particular campaign was entirely successful in winning over the leaders of his own party and of the Whigs. As one historian of the central administration of English education in the nineteenth century has recognized, Pakington was "largely instrumental in securing the creation of the Vice-Presidency ... the first piece of legislation relating to English elementary education to reach the statute book." (1)

It is unlikely that Pakington saw his Bill of 1855 merely as a stalking horse for the department issue, rather did he run the two in harness with the hope that one, if not both, would prove to be acceptable. Thus on 11 January 1855 when sending his Outline to Derby his covering letter concluded, "You will also perceive that I propose to increase the powers and duties of the Committee of Council to an extent, which I think would render necessary a re-constitution of that Department - ... I am not at all satisfied with the present working of the Committee of Council." (2) Pakington stated here that the functions of the Committee had already outgrown its constitution and that a separate act would be necessary

---

(1) A.S. Bishop, The Rise of a Central Authority for English Education (1971), 47-8, though one might query the second part of the statement.

(2) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 11 January 1855.

to establish a proper department. His covering letter to Brougham was concluded in similar terms. For neither Parliament nor the country, Pakington maintained, realised that "... the system of the Committee of Council is working badly, and that the Parliamentary grants effect the minimum of good ... I hope your Lordship will agree with me in the demand that the Committee of Council shall be recognised as a Department and be represented in Parliament, and act under proper Parliamentary responsibility - This part of the case will not be in my Bill - It should be dealt with separately - but it will be in my statement, for I attach great importance to it, and more especially as my plan will entrust the Education Department, whatever it may be called, with increased powers." (1)

Pakington was true to his word. Not only in his opening statement on the first reading of his Education Bill on 16 March, eight days after his letter to Brougham, but on every conceivable opportunity during his Commons speeches of 1855 Pakington attacked the constitution and workings of the Committee of Council on Education. It was a favourable moment so to do. Administrative reform was in the air. The inefficiency of Army and Civil Service were widely acknowledged. Disraeli saw this as an issue which the Conservatives could with advantage adopt, and he encouraged Richard Bromley (2) to draw up schemes for administrative reform. Though Disraeli later warned Pakington of Bromley's "ravenous egotism" and that "the object of all his changes was to advance the permanent at the expense of the

---

(1) U.C.L. Brougham Mss. 5704, Pakington to Brougham, 8 March 1855.
(2) Later Sir Richard Bromley; Disraeli made considerable use of him during the 1858-9 ministry.

Parliamentary officials," (1) in 1855 Disraeli took the matter seriously enough, and by December was himself suggesting a "Bill for the more efficient Administration of the Public Affairs of this Realm". Disraeli's scheme envisaged a Cabinet of ten which would include a Minister of Education. True this minister would have other responsibilities, in particular those of registration, (2) but nevertheless Pakington's basic principle was accepted. Derby was characteristically cautious and Stanley was despatched to Hughenden. In a revised scheme Education was seen, along with Health and the Poor Law, as a second rank office, but nevertheless Derby was in 1856 sufficiently convinced to support the concept of "a Minister at the head of a Department who should have no other duties to perform and who should be, in fact, responsible for the education of the people." (3) Thus Pakington had convinced the leaders of his own party, but the extract from Derby's speech, quoted above, was on the occasion of the announcement in the Lords of the Government's plans for the creation of an Education Department with a Vice-President, and his more important achievement had been in convincing his political opponents. There were several lines of resistance. Russell and others had a parental fondness for the 1839 system. Peelites like Gladstone and Graham would argue that multiplication of offices, especially a mere Vice-Presidency with an inflated salary of £2,000 p.a. should be resisted on the grounds of economy. Voluntaryists would oppose any extension of state power in education.

Pakington's grounds for reform were three in number; firstly that the functions and disbursments of the Committee

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/7/(11)/18, Disraeli to Pakington, 18 January 1864.
(2) For example of births, marriages and deaths.
(3) Hansard, CXL, 315, 15 February 1856. Derby believed that in most instances a single responsible minister was much more efficient than a board.

of Council were far greater than in 1839, secondly that government expenditure on education was ineffectively applied, and thirdly that such considerable annual expenditure on education required a responsible minister in the Commons. Thus on the first reading of his Bill he argued that the work of the Committee had become too important "... to continue any longer without being recognised as a department of the State, and distinctly represented in this House ... our grants are badly administered ... no body of men ought to be intrusted with the administration of so large a sum for public purposes, without there being a responsible Minister in this House who can account for the manner of its employment." (1) Pakington also pointed to the example of other countries with Ministers of Public Instruction or Departments of Education, France, Prussia, Switzerland, Holland, U.S.A. . Clearly Sir George Grey, the Home Secretary, (2) was taken out of his stride by Pakington's tactics. He defended the Committee of Council and yet admitted that he, Grey, "had anticipated from that part of his (3) speech, and from the strictures which he passed upon the Committee of Council on Education, that he was about to propose the establishment of a Minister of Public Instruction." (4) But this was not Pakington's plan, and on 17 April he asked Grey, in the absence of Palmerston, "whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce any measure during the present Session for altering the constitution of the Committee of Council on Education, so as to ensure a direct representation of that department in the House of Commons?" (5)

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 644, 16 March 1855.
(2) The Home Secretary generally assumed responsibility for Education in the Commons.
(3) Pakington's speech.
(4) Hansard, CXXXVII, 682, 16 March 1855.
(5) Hansard, CXXXVII, 1503, 17 April 1855.

The Home Secretary referred back to Pakington's speech of 16 March, which had clearly made an impression upon him, and though he declined to promise any alteration in the present session, or to express any firm opinion on the subject, he did concede that "if such an office was created, the duties would be sufficiently grave and onerous for such a responsible Minister. There were besides education other matters connected with it, such as those appertaining to the department of art and science now under the Board of Trade, which might be included among the duties of such an office." (1)

Even on the second reading of his Bill, at the conclusion of his long and detailed reply to Henley, Pakington remembered to prod the Government again. "He hoped, also, that the present constitution of the Committee of Council on Education would be changed, and that it would be converted into a recognised department of the State, represented in that House by a Minister who would be able to give authoritative answers to questions that might be put to him upon the subject of education." (2)

Finally and fittingly, when on 2 July Pakington spoke on the occasion of the withdrawal of his Bill, Russell, who followed after a brief interruption by Hadfield, announced his conversion, and presumably that of the Cabinet, to Pakington's point of view. "There was one subject upon which the right hon. Baronet had touched when he moved for leave to introduce his Bill, with regard to which he wished to say a few words - he referred to the Committee of Council of Education. When that Committee was appointed he did not think that any better means could be adopted for managing the Educational Votes than by intrusting the control of them to a council of several Ministers, but circumstances had since changed, and he thought that it would be for the benefit of the public

---

(1) Loc. cit.
(2) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1827, 11 June 1855.

service if the President of the Committee of Council were to be acknowledged as the Minister of Education, and that the department of education should be represented in that House by a person who might, perhaps hold the rank of a Privy Councillor, and who might be able to defend any measure that might be adopted, and who would be prepared at all times to explain the views of the Government with regard to the general question of education." (1) Russell advised that the Government was earnestly considering the matter, and hoped to lay "a scheme for the regulation of an educational department" before Parliament early next session.

Even so Pakington did not relax his efforts, for Russell's resignation of office (2) shortly after this statement raised Pakington's fears. In the Supply debate on 26 July he expressed the hope that this would be the last occasion on which a Home Secretary would move the Education estimates, (3) and though Palmerston made no direct speech in reply he did intimate across the table that he concurred in Russell's observations of 2 July and intended to act upon them. When in 1856 the Speech from the Throne contained no reference to an education measure Pakington took the Government to task for the omission. He referred to the general issues of national education, to Russell's speech of 2 July, to Palmerston's assurances during the Supply debate, and "appealed to the Government in the hope that they would not recede from those declarations." (4) Grey replied that the Government had no "large and comprehensive" measure on education to introduce, and nothing that was deemed worthy of mention

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXIX, 386-7, 2 July 1855.
(2) He gave up the Colonial Office on 13 July.
(3) Hansard, CXXXIX, 1410, 26 July 1855. It was not, however, so, and a year later Pakington expressed the same hope again; Supply debate, Hansard, CXLII, 1358, 12 June 1856.
(4) Hansard, CXL, 104, 1 February 1856.

in the Queen's Speech, but nevertheless, in accordance with Russell's statement of 2 July 1855, an Education Department would be established with a responsible minister in the Commons. It is unlikely that the Government was contemplating reneguing on Russell's statement. The unobtrusive approach had much to recommend it. Granville, the Lord President, had been in possession of a memorandum from Lingen on the 'Representation of the Education Department in the House of Commons' (1) since June 1855, and when introducing the second reading of the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education Bill in the Lords on 15 February he paid an important tribute to Pakington's initiative.

"Earl Granville in moving the second reading of the Bill, said that the arrangement proposed in it would carry out the pledge given first by Lord J. Russell, and subsequently by Sir George Grey, in compliance with a suggestion made by Sir John Pakington, a right hon. Gentleman who had done so much for education last year, not only by the knowledge and ability which he has shown in dealing with the question, but also by the example which he has set of treating those great social questions apart from any party feeling. Last year the right hon. Gentleman suggested, in another place, that, considering the large grants of money now made for the purpose of promoting education, it would be desirable that some Minister should be appointed who should be responsible to the House of Commons for the proper distribution of those grants, and who could answer any question that might be put upon the subject. The Vice President would have a seat in the other House, unless the President were a member of the House of Commons, in which case the Vice President might have a seat in their Lordships' House ... The new Department of Education in

---

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/53, Memorandum, 6 June 1855.

the Council Office would also take charge of the department of science and art ... ." (1)

The reforms of 1856, as Granville acknowledged, should be attributed to Pakington rather than to any other single individual. That the reforms were insufficient and incomplete was recognised by no one more clearly than Pakington himself. He constantly encouraged the new department to take a greater initiative in education, and to secure further modifications of its constitution. The Select Committee of 1865-6 was the climax of his work in this sphere. It could be argued that Pakington's pressure for reform was premature and incomplete in 1855-6, that had the unsatisfactory system continued for a few more years a fundamental reform in the 1860's or 1870's would in the long run have been more beneficial and have produced a genuine Minister and Ministry of Education. But the converse is probably true. That England waited until 1899 for a Board of Education and until 1944 for a Ministry should not be attributed to the success of Pakington's campaign in 1855-6, but rather to the failure of later politicians to follow his example.

The education debate of the 1850's was carried on in Parliament, in pamphlets and in the press, and the introduction of Russell's resolutions in 1856 provided a particular opportunity for those who had expressed their arguments once in 1855, and those who had rehearsed them in private against the next occasion, to parade them anew.

---

(1) Hansard, CXL, 814-15, 15 February 1856. Pakington recorded in his diary "Lord Granville in moving 2nd reading of Education Department Bill, avowed most gracefully that plan was adopted at my suggestion." Ewart, however, had suggested some fifteen years earlier the "appointment of a minister who should devote his attention to Public Education", and he wrote to Granville to remind him of this. Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/18/12/3-4, Ewart to Granville, 16 February 1856.

The Times in March and April 1856 printed a series of letters on the education issue by some who wrote over their own names and some who did not. Denison was in the former category, and he fulminated against both an education rate and compulsory schooling. (1) Pakington was concerned by the testimony of those clergymen who assumed that because there was sufficient school provision in their own parish or district the situation was similar in all parts of the country. He was particularly incensed by a letter from 'A Nottinghamshire Clergyman' (2) and wrote a speedy reply. (3) Though the letter had not mentioned Pakington by name such terms as "tinkerers" and "education mongers" rankled, for Pakington thought it impossible to over-rate the damage inflicted upon his work for national education by "the attempts of zealous but indiscreet men to lecture the public upon what they do not themselves understand." (4) The 'Nottinghamshire Clergyman' had argued from his personal experience of both manufacturing and rural communities that excellent schools and efficient teachers were in good supply and that the only problem was to compel the children to attend them. He therefore concluded that the "one effectual remedy" was that of compulsory attendance.

Pakington's reply, printed in The Times on 18 March above a letter on the same topic from Denison, was signed 'A Promoter of Education'. It was written in a particularly forceful style and castigated those who, though actuated by the best of motives, were ignorant of the true state of education. He warned against generalizing from examples of individual parishes or

---

(1) The Times, 18 March 1856.
(2) The Times, 13 March 1856.
(3) Pakington's reply was dated 13 March but his diary suggests that it was actually written on the following day, 14 March.
(4) The Times, 18 March 1856.

districts. He urged the 'Clergyman' to read his own Commons speeches of 1855, Russell's speech of 6 March 1856, Mann's census report, the reports of diocesan inspectors and of H.M.I.'s, all of which showed the extent of educational deficiency. He quoted in particular from a report by H.M.I. Kennedy about the problems of maintaining good schools. Pakington concluded with three major points. Firstly, that the "premature" work of children was not as widespread as the 'Nottinghamshire Clergyman' had supposed, secondly that compulsion would eventually be necessary but thirdly, "that good schools must be everywhere established before attendance at them can by law be everywhere compelled."

This was an important issue of principle. (1) Pakington's argument, an argument followed by Forster in 1870, was that the country must first be covered with good schools, by means of an education rate, and that only then could compulsory attendance be achieved. The opposing theory was that there were already sufficient school places, and that the only point at issue was whether it was justifiable to compel parents to send their children to them. A corollary, which seems to have developed from about 1855, to this argument was that as the schools became more efficient children would need to spend less time in them, (2) and that therefore the numbers of children in school, or at least the ratio to the overall population, might properly stabilize or even go into decline. This partly explains Pakington's developing

---

(1) Other significant contributions to the debate on compulsion would include R. Applegarth, Compulsory Attendance at School. The Working Men's View (1870); D. Campbell, Compulsory Education (2nd ed., 1870); D. Coleridge, Compulsory Education and Rate-Payment (1867); T. Mortimer, Compulsory Education, inconsistent with freedom and inimical to knowledge (1859).

(2) See, for example, F. Close, A few more words on Education Bills (1856), 6.

concern with the issue of efficiency, and particularly with the quality, or lack of quality of the teaching profession. This theme, which will be considered later in relation to the Newcastle Commission stemmed originally not from the work and report of that Commission but from Pakington's attempts to refute the argument that the quality of schooling, as distinct from the quantity, was generally acceptable.

Pakington was not therefore declaring himself to be against compulsory schooling. As he had recently stated in the Commons, "Sooner or later the compulsory principle must be recognised, otherwise it will be impossible to carry out any plan for the general education of the people in this country." (1) He simply feared that the argument would focus on the very contentious issue of compulsion, that it would be accepted that there was sufficient school provision and that the case for the education rate, the most immediate requirement and the only means, he believed, for ensuring a constant and adequate supply of funds, would be ignored.

The 'Nottinghamshire Clergyman', though he had promised further letters did not reply, but the Reverend Mr. Woodgate (2) wrote from Bellbroughton Rectory on 26 March in his defence, and supported the view that the real problem was "not how to erect schools but how to procure children to fill them." (3) Pakington replied, again under the same pseudonym, (4) but this time he concentrated, as Woodgate had done, upon the issue of a rate. He queried Woodgate's use of the term "means of education". For Pakington the means of education did not end with the provision of a schoolroom. It included a steady regular income to supply all the school needs.

---

(1) Hansard, CXL, 1998-9, 6 March 1856.
(2) H.A. Woodgate, a diocesan inspector.
(3) The Times, 28 March 1856.
(4) The Times, 1 April 1856, the letter was written on 29 March.

If the general cost was 6d per child per week, and the average parental contribution only 2d per child, the remaining 4d must be furnished, in part at least, by a rate. Though Woodgate might find in each parish of his deanery a good schoolroom - i.e. one larger than required by the number of scholars, Pakington asked whether he would also "find in many of these good schoolrooms bad schoolmasters," and were "the schools worth going to?" As Pakington shrewdly remarked, if, as Woodgate argued, in most areas good schooling was provided for all under the existing system, then there would be no need for a rate in such places.

Woodgate had conceded that there were hundreds of thousands of children between the ages of six and fifteen who were neither at work or at school, but had suggested that "faith and patience" were the best remedy. Pakington expressed his own faith shaken and his patience exhausted. The majority of the clergy and a significant number of the laity, he believed, had banded together "to impede any extensive measure for the improvement of education," because they feared that "If this bill passes it will interfere with my school." Pakington argued for a wider common good, and whilst giving credit to those who had established, or were supporting schools, deplored the selfishness which prevented the extension of education to others. Pakington's concluding sentences, written indeed under the cloak of anonymity and bearing some of the characteristics of his more florid oratorical style, but nevertheless stirring enough to suggest that education would not have suffered had he more frequently championed his cause through the written word, were as follows; "It will ultimately be found, I feel no doubt, that "my school" is not in danger; but if it is, Parliament must think of all. Shakespeare says "Good reason must of force give place to better." Benefits which are merely local must give place to the general

good ... The Henleys, and Hadfields, and Woodgates may succeed for a time; but the day is at hand when sounder views will prevail, and when, under the auspices of the new department a really national system will be at last adopted." (1)

There can be no doubting Pakington's authorship of these two letters. The subject matter, the line of argument, the style, the pseudonym are in themselves significant pointers, and they are fully confirmed by two entries in his diary. (2) What is more doubtful is whether Pakington adopted the correct attitude, both in the short and the long term, towards the issue of compulsion, particularly in the light of the impression created as to the near sufficiency of school provision by the report of the Newcastle Commission. What is certain, however, is that Pakington could not accept the argument for compulsion in the context in which it was presented in the Spring of 1856, namely that there were already sufficient schools of good quality in existence. He knew otherwise.

The twelve resolutions of Lord John Russell, the second major parliamentary educational concern of 1856, were also influenced by Pakington's speeches of 1855. Russell was driven to proceeding by means of resolutions by the failure of previous independently-sponsored bills, as highlighted by the demise of Pakington's measure in 1855, and by the Government's refusal to introduce legislation for elementary education in 1856. The method had been tried before, notably by Brougham, though

---

(1) The Times, 1 April 1856.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/2/(1)/8, Diary, 14 March 1856, "Wrote letter to Times in answer to Nottingham clergyman on education - heard from the Editor next day that it should appear on Monday," and 1 April 1856, "Published 2nd letter in Times on education, in answer to Woodgate."

unsuccessfully, but Russell hoped thereby to induce the House to agree on some general principles which could be followed in tackling the education question.

On 6 March 1856 Russell in introducing the resolutions made frequent reference to the influence of Pakington's work. (1) He began indeed by considering the issue of a general measure for education, and by advising that "The task was attempted by Mr. Whitbread and Lord Brougham, and last year by the right hon. Baronet the member for Droitwich (Sir J. Pakington), who brought forward, with great research and great ability, a proposition for a Bill upon the subject." (2) Though Pakington's statements in 1855 as to the want of education had been regarded by many, including Russell, as exaggerations Russell now confirmed their accuracy. "I think it due to the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir J. Pakington) to say that in following him, I have carefully examined the various authorities which he cited, and I must say that his research has been most accurate, and that his statements are most deserving of the attention and consideration of the House." (3) Russell now also accepted Pakington's strictures upon the system of distribution of Privy Council grants as "one designed to give assistance to those who are able of themselves to provide, whether by subscriptions, by school pence, or from other sources, the needful funds for maintaining teachers and schools." (4) Russell even announced his conversion on the emotive issue of the inviolability of parochial boundaries. "It is obvious that the present divisions into parishes are not in all cases the most

---

(1) Hansard, CXL, 1955-80, 6 March 1856. Pakington recorded in his diary, "Lord John Russell moved Education resolutions in able speech of 1 hour 55 minutes, referred much to me. I spoke ...."
(2) Hansard, CXL, 1955, 6 March 1856.
(3) Ibid., 1956-7.
(4) Ibid., 1962.

convenient divisions for educational purposes. The right hon. Baronet (Sir J. Pakington) urged that point upon the attention of the House last year. I then differed from him in opinion, but, I must own, I am now satisfied that his views were perfectly correct." (1)

Of Russell's resolutions the seventh was perhaps the most important; "That it is expedient that, in any school district where the means of education arising from endowment, subscription, grants and school pence shall be found deficient, and shall be declared to be so by the Committee of Privy Council for Education, the ratepayers should have the power of taxing themselves for the erection and maintenance of a school or schools." (2) Pakington expressed "heartfelt thanks" to Russell "for the able, temperate, and impressive manner in which he had addressed the House" (3) and asked that the resolutions should receive serious consideration. He no doubt hoped that just as his own efforts in 1855 had produced a Government Bill in 1856, Russell's resolutions might lead to an official measure, the first initiative of the new Department perhaps, for national education in 1857. But their opponents, notably Henley and Hadfield, also hoped to repeat their triumphs of 1855, and were relieved to find that Russell proposed deferring full discussion of the resolutions until after Easter. It was agreed "That this House will, upon Thursday the 10th day of April next, resolve itself into a Committee, to consider the present state of Public Education in England and Wales." (4) Once again the Easter recess was put to the marshalling of arguments.

One important development was an exchange of letters between Pakington and Russell which showed the growing personal rapprochement between the two on the education

---

(1) Ibid., 1966.
(2) Ibid., 1971.
(3) Ibid., 1995.
(4) Ibid., 2015.

issue. Pakington wrote on 25 March, "I believe that it is only by cordial co-operation between those Gentlemen on both sides of the House who share the views which your Lordship and I entertain in common that we shall be able to resist successfully the combination between the ultra Church party on my side and the ultra voluntary party on yours - " [1] Pakington enclosed a copy of the Outline of his 1855 Bill, and suggested one or two amendments to the resolutions. He also questioned whether Russell was wise to enter into too many precise details of facts and figures. [2] The general tone of the letter, however, was constructive and conciliatory, and Russell replied in the same vein, finding nothing contrary to the spirit of the resolutions in Pakington's proposed amendments, and expecting Pakington's "powerful assistance" on the delicate issue of "clubbing parishes together". [3] Two special meetings of the Committee of the National Society were called to consider Russell's resolutions. At the first on 8 April a sub-committee which included Adderley and Henley was set up to draw up a petition to Parliament, and on 10 April the petition was considered. [4]

On that same day, 10 April, parliamentary discussion was resumed. Neither Cobden, whose only son had died and whose wife was in a state of nervous exhaustion, nor Bright, himself indisposed since January, was present, whilst Hadfield presented a petition from the Chairman and Secretary of a Committee of Friends of Voluntary

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/59, Copy of Pakington to Russell, 25 March 1856.

(2) Russell had for example quoted a sum of £3,240,000 p.a. to educate 3,600,000 children. This cost would be shared between grants, rates, subscriptions, children's pence, etc.

(3) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/60, Russell to Pakington, 26 March 1856.

(4) N.S.R.O. National Society General Committee Minute Book, V, 471, 8 April 1856, and 473, 10 April 1856. A copy of the petition is included.

Education against the resolutions. Two major speeches were delivered against Russell's proposals by Henley [1] and Graham. [2] Henley was moderate in tone and concluded not by proposing a direct negative but rather that the Chairman do now leave the chair. But Graham's speech was something of a revelation. For Graham who on 10 April 1856 "in a very able speech made mincemeat of Johnny and his Education resolutions," [3] who now based his conviction that voluntary education and the existing system were sufficient upon pamphlets by Baines [4] and Unwin, [5] was the same Sir James Graham who in 1843 had been forced to abandon his schemes for factory education by the same extreme Voluntaryists led by Baines and his Leeds Mercury whose doctrines he was now championing. [6] Moreover by one of the odd coincidences of history, on 10 April 1843, exactly thirteen years earlier to the day, Russell had introduced ten resolutions in a vain search for a compromise which would have preserved the essential features of Graham's scheme. Pakington followed Graham in the debate, and did his best to counter the impression which the latter's speech had created, but to little avail. [7] Whilst Graham's

---

(1) Hansard, CXLI, 780-99, 10 April 1856.
(2) Ibid., 830-52.
(3) Granville to Canning, 11 April 1856, quoted in Lord E. Fitzmaurice, The Life of Granville George Leveson Gower (2 vols., 1905), I, 176.
(4) E. Baines, National Education. Remarks on the speech and plan of Lord John Russell (1856).
(5) W.J. Unwin, Education the Work of the People. A letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord J. Russell ... on the resolutions for establishing a system of National Education submitted to Parliament (1856). Unwin, Principal of Homerton, and editor of The Educator, was the author of several works on teaching method.
(6) For a discussion of 1843 see J.T. Ward, ' A Lost Opportunity in Education: 1843', Leeds Researches and Studies in Education, XX, 1959.
(7) Pakington's diary, 10 April 1856. "Lord John Russell's resolutions on Education debated. Henley opposed. Graham made effective but fallacious speech. I replied in speech of 1½ hours, which ended debate, but it was clear that House was against Lord John."

chief opposition to the proposals was on grounds of expense, other speeches on 10 April showed that Russell by including so much in his resolutions had managed to displease everyone. Pakington's speech (1) was controlled, factual, accurate and pedestrian, once again, as in 1855, he was unable to produce the impassioned oratory which the situation required. There were almost as many tributes to Graham's speech of 1856 as there had been to Henley's of the previous year, and the chief of them was paid by Russell who, when the debate resumed on the next day, withdrew seven of his resolutions only to be soundly defeated on the others. Russell's actions on 11 April were typical of the vacillation which characterized his approach to politics at this time, and rightly merited Pakington's disapproval. When Russell informed him that he would give up seven of the resolutions, Pakington's reaction was that it would be better to abandon them all. But Russell pressed on, and referred back to the events of 1843. Russell clearly "hoped to stop discussion but he failed. Adverse division on even 1st resolution was forced - painful scene - more passion than reason." (2) The first resolution was innocuous enough, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to extend, revise and consolidate the Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council on Education", but Henley's motion was carried by 260 votes to 158, a majority of 102. Henley and Thesiger acted as tellers for the Ayes, and Cardwell, Disraeli, Milner Gibson, Gladstone, Graham, Lowe and Miall were numbered amongst the majority. The Noes included M.T. Baines, Ewart, Fox, Goderich, Grey, Layard and Palmerston, with Russell and Pakington as tellers.

Pakington now did his utmost to secure a reversal of the impression created by the vote of 11 April. He

---

(1) Hansard, CXLI, 852-65, 10 April 1856.
(2) Pakington's diary, 11 April 1856.

decided to use the occasion of the presentation of the Education estimates to raise the matter anew, and in pursuit of this strategy secured a promise from Palmerston that due notice should be given before the Supply debate. When on 6 June the Government tried to present the Education estimates with what was for Pakington a bare half hour's notice, Pakington successfully secured their postponement until the following week. (1)

Thus when on 12 June Grey (2) finally proposed the annual vote for public education, he was followed by Pakington who made no comment upon the estimate but devoted his speech (3) to a consideration of Russell's proposals and to countering the effect of "the extraordinary and, as I think, unsatisfactory division upon those Resolutions." (4) Pakington suggested that "The feeling out of doors is, that the intention of the House of Commons was to declare that a large majority of its Members was unfavourable to the extension of public education in this country," (5) and that something should be done to counteract that impression. He commented at length upon the division, upon the speeches of Henley, Graham and Gladstone, and then returned to his theme of proving the extent of educational deficiency. Ewart was one who tried to prevent this speech as contravening the rules of the Commons, but Pakington was sufficiently versed in the practice of the House to know that whilst no allusion could be made to a past debate in the same session of Parliament, the previous discussion had taken place in another Committee of the whole House of which the present Committee of Supply was not technically cognisant, and that therefore, strictly speaking, he could not be ruled out of order. This

---

(1) Hansard, CXLII, 1107, 6 June 1856.
(2) Hansard, CXLII, 1343-50, 12 June 1856.
(3) Ibid., 1350-9.
(4) Ibid., 1350.
(5) Ibid., 1352.

speech of 12 June was important for several reasons, three of which should be noted here. The first, already referred to, was the considerable ingenuity which Pakington had employed in creating the opportunity for the speech, whose prime purpose was to place as favourable a construction as possible upon the vote of 11 April. The second was his attack on Gladstone's speech [1] delivered upon that earlier occasion. Again this was a matter upon which Pakington was fully prepared, and he even wrote to Gladstone on the morning of 12 June [2] to inform him of the "pain and sorrow" he, Pakington, had felt on listening to Gladstone's conclusions, and imploring him to investigate the matter more thoroughly. Pakington had convinced Russell, Grey and Palmerston on one issue in 1855, he now sought to persuade Gladstone in 1856. Finally Pakington declared himself sanguine that the new Department would next session introduce an education measure, but "if the Government will not introduce their own Bill, I shall be strongly tempted to introduce it for them." [3] And so indeed he did.

Pakington's predictions as to the future activities of the new Department and its Minister were somewhat premature on 12 June. One result of the defeat of Russell's resolutions had been a suggestion that the Vice-President of the Council Bill should also be withdrawn. Though the Bill received a second reading in the Commons without a division on 17 July, on the following day the Vice-President's salary of £2,000 p.a. was only approved by 78 votes to 47. On a third reading on 22 July Henley, Gladstone and Graham all spoke against the Bill, when it was finally approved by 77 votes to 35.

---

(1) Hansard, CXLI, 941-53, 11 April 1856.
(2) Gladstone Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 44386, 11-12, Pakington to Gladstone, 12 June 1856.
(3) Hansard, CXLII, 1358, 12 June 1856.

Pakington's prestige as a parliamentary champion of education reached a peak in February 1856 with the Government's adoption of his Education Department scheme. But the year ended with another achievement which promised for a while to be of even greater significance, and which provided the basis for the Bill of 1857.

The essential background to the Manchester speech and to the union of education groups was Pakington's continued commitment to the promotion of education at the local level. His diary provides a useful record of the engagements which he fulfilled. Thus for example on 12 February he reluctantly gave up Herby's [1] eighth birthday party, travelled to Birmingham where he visited Saltley Training College in the afternoon, and in the evening presided at a great meeting of the Birmingham branch of the Church Education Society at which he spoke for an hour. On 15 May he attended briefly the Church Education Society meeting in London, and in August was in Bristol for the Reformatory Conference presided over by Lord Stanley. As always he inspected educational and reformatory establishments, for example on 22 August he visited Kingswood Reformatory, [2] Miss Carpenter's Red Lodge reformatory for girls, a refuge for discharged female prisoners, an industrial school, a ragged school and an orphan asylum which he thought "most striking and extraordinary".

At the end of October he attended the annual meeting of the Saltley College at Birmingham and the Diocesan Education Board at Worcester. Though in August illness had forced him to give up attendance at a meeting in Worcester to establish a Mechanics' Institute, in

---

(1) Pakington was also concerned for his son's education at this time, for Miss Sharpe, Herby's governess, in a fit of pique that she was not to go to Ryde for the Review, resigned, and a Mr. Stone was engaged as tutor.

(2) John Wesley's former residence.

November he journeyed to Huddersfield to be present at the prizegiving of the Mechanics' Institute there. In November also came an invitation [1] to join the committee of a new Educational Association to be formed in Birmingham. At a meeting on 11 November at Chad Lodge, Edgbaston, the residence of John Fawkener Winfield, attended by fourteen clergymen and twelve laymen, including Lord Calthorpe, G.W. Hastings and T.C. Sneyd Kennersley, resolutions were adopted that Christian education was essential to the well-being of society, that a Committee be established to inquire into the state of education in the Birmingham area, and to seek such measures as should be necessary for its improvement. Other powerful names were soon added to the Committee; Lyttelton, Adderley, Spooner, Muntz, Scholefield, Northcote, M.D. Hill. They were moved by the plight of children left to wander the streets exposed to crime and other temptations, by the sufferings of youngsters employed in manufactories and workshops whose hours of work precluded even minimum education. The solutions they envisaged included "the application to the hardware district of a modification of the Factory Act, and generally of the Act known in Scotland as Dunlop's Act." [2]

Pakington's thoughts in November, however, were centred upon Manchester. He had been invited to address the Manchester Athenaeum for the advancement and diffusion of knowledge. Richard Cobden and James Heywood were two M.P.'s who had made their first public speeches in the Athenaeum, an institution for the middle and upper strata of Manchester society. Its subscribers were drawn from the industrial, commercial and professional classes, and the audience, numbering about 500, which Pakington

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/4/(111)/M/B/7a, Winfield to Pakington, 28 November 1856.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/4/(111)/M/B/7c, a printed account of the meeting of 11 November 1856.

addressed, was confined to members and a few select friends. Nevertheless Pakington's speech, entitled 'National Education', was fully reported in The Times (1) and other papers and received such acclaim that it was separately printed. (2)

Pakington and Johnny were met at Stockport station on 17 November, and stayed at Abney Hall, Cheshire the residence of James Watt, the mayor of Manchester. That evening at dinner Pakington met more than twenty distinguished friends of education in the area. On the next day, while Johnny visited Manchester, Pakington conned over his speech. In the evening, after dinner with Alderman Nicholls, the former mayor, at Eagley House, Sir Elkanah Armitage, the President of the Athenaeum and a man of very few words, took the chair, and introduced Pakington to "loud and continued applause". Henry Hadfield Jones, the Secretary, had advised him that an hour's address was customary, characteristically Pakington spoke for nearly two. (3)

Nearly two years earlier, when replying to Pakington's proposals for the Bill of 1855, Cobden had suggested that Pakington should contact Canon Richson as a first step towards seeking some agreement between the various promoters of educational reform in the Manchester area. (4) Now, on 19 November 1856, again on Cobden's suggestion, a conference was arranged "between Sir John Pakington on the one hand, and a few of the leading supporters and friends of the National Public School Association and of the late Manchester and Salford School Committee (5) on

---

(1) The Times, 20 November 1856. Reports of Pakington's activities in Manchester also appeared in the editions of 19 and 21 November.
(2) J.S. Pakington, National Education. Address delivered ... to the Members of the Manchester Athenaeum, November 18th, 1856 (1856).
(3) Pakington's speech contained little that was new, but was a useful review of the education issue 1855-6.
(4) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 8-10, Cobden to Pakington, 13 January 1855.
(5) It was dissolved in 1855.

the other, to agree, if possible on the points on which these bodies have hitherto differed, with a view to united action." (1) Cobden had clearly taken the initiative in suggesting this meeting. His letter to Pakington asked Pakington and Richson to meet the committee of the N.P.S.A. . Cobden urged that many of the N.P.S.A. supporters, men such as McKerrow, Beard and Tucker, were as anxious to have a religious component in education as any supporter of the National Society, but that it was necessary to separate secular from doctrinal tuition both in time and place. Cobden was here advocating the principle "... which was laid down by Lord Stanley for Ireland, - <u>separate</u> religious and <u>combined</u> secular teaching; ... Can it be doubted that we must come to it, or abandon any hope of ever having a system deserving the name of national? Where is the difficulty? It is not a question of principle that separates you from us, but merely one between nine o'clock and some other hour of the day. It seems to me that the likeliest solution of the case would be first to come to an understanding out of doors as between the two parties in Manchester, and then present a joint petition to Parliament for powers to levy a rate in Manchester. From what I heard from Mr. Richson it did not seem impossible that such an agreement could be come to. Pray see all parties, and make yourself acquainted with their views ... ." (2)

Pakington approved Cobden's suggestion and made

---

(1) <u>The Times</u>, 19 November 1856.
(2) Cobden to Pakington, November 1856. A copy was sent to Dr. McKerrow and extracts are printed in J.M. McKerrow, <u>Memoir of William McKerrow D.D.</u> (1881), 180-1.

personal contact with McKerrow [1] and other N.P.S.A. leaders. On the morning of 19 November he visited a School for Outdoor Pauper Children and the famous Model Secular School in Jackson's Row. [2] The Secular School, established under the auspices of the N.P.S.A. enjoyed McKerrow's particular support. Pakington was impressed by some aspects of its work, but personally regretted the exclusion of the Bible, and compared the system unfavourably with that of King Edward's Birmingham. At the private meeting, which was scheduled for noon at the York Hotel Buildings, and which lasted for one and a half hours, Thomas Bazley presided, and others present included Canon Clifton, [3] McKerrow, P. Bunting, R. Gladstone, J.A. Nicholls, C.H. Minckin, and R.W. Smiles. The meeting was cordial and five resolutions were unanimously agreed, although with the major reservation that none of the parties with whom those present were connected was to be held committed to them. A sixth resolution was added at a subsequent meeting in December.

---

(1) William McKerrow D.D. (1803-1878). First Moderator of the United Presbytery of Manchester. He was, with John Bright, one of the original proprietors of the Manchester Examiner which first appeared on 10 January 1846, and in 1848, after an amalgamation became the Manchester Examiner and Times. It supported the policy of unsectarian national education.

(2) There is an interesting account of the Model Secular School in D.K. Jones, 'The Educational Legacy of the Anti-Corn Law League', History of Education, III(1), 1974, 25-32. Jones characterizes the school as the N.P.S.A.'s "most tangible contribution to education".

(3) Clifton deputised for Richson who was unavoidably absent, visiting a sick relative in London. Richson had charge of a poor parish, St. Andrew's with a population of 13,000 souls, but in addition to his work for the education societies of Manchester he was also a noted pamphleteer. His writings included, Education. The Government measure shown to be susceptible of improvement on its own principles (1853), The Difficulties of the Education Question (1859) and the important The Agencies and Organization required in a National System of Education (1856), a thirty page pamphlet which called for "a Comprehensive and Effectual System of Education." It was reprinted from the Transactions of the Manchester Statistical Society.

"1. That a Rate for Education is desirable.

2. That all Schools deriving aid from the Rate, shall be subject to Inspection, but such Inspection as is paid for out of the Rate shall not extend to Religious Instruction.

3. That all Schools shall be entitled to aid out of the Rate, provided the Instruction, other than Religious, shall come up to a required standard, and that no child shall be excluded on Religious grounds.

4. That distinctive Religious Formularies, where taught, shall be taught at some hour to be specified by the Managers of the School, in each case, in order to facilitate the withdrawal of those children whose Parents or Guardians may object to their instruction in such distinctive Religious Formularies.

5. That there be no interference with the Management or Instruction of Schools, other than may be needed to carry out the principles of the foregoing resolutions.

6. That the Education Rate be administered by Local Authorities, to be specially elected by, and out of the Rate-payers for the purpose." (1)

Two schools inspected and one conference successfully concluded, Pakington had good reason to congratulate himself on his progress so far on Wednesday, 19 November. He spent the afternoon in lionizing Watt's warehouses and Whitworth's works, returned to Abney for dinner, and in the evening attended a Bachelor ball, which he much enjoyed, at New Hall. (2) The following day Pakington,

---

(1) These are the Resolutions as amended and confirmed at a meeting on 5 December 1856. They are taken from a printed copy enclosed by Smiles in a letter to Cobden, Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 72-3, Smiles to Cobden,20 December 1856. Pakington also sent a copy to Northcote, Iddesleigh Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 50022, 247. Pakington's letter is missing, but Northcote's reply is dated 'Christmas' 1856. The original five resolutions, as agreed on 19 November are printed in The Times of 21 November 1856.

(2) Pakington's diary, 19 November 1856.

accompanied by Johnny, returned to Westwood. He surrounded himself with copies of newspapers which praised both his speech and his initiative in securing the conference and the resolutions, and by December he was busy preparing his speech for publication. (1)

It was more difficult to translate the resolutions into a bill. Pakington had enjoyed his stay in Manchester and had been "much fortified by the kindness and hospitality" with which he had been received, but he wrote anxiously to Cobden, "Will there be any further attempts at legislation for Manchester?" (2) Bazley also wrote to Cobden asking whether he would consent to his name being placed upon a bill for promoting education in Manchester. Cobden hedged. He thought it essential that Milner Gibson's support should be secured, and that if Milner Gibson's name were to stand first, "as I am known to share his opinions the addition of my name would be of little practical importance. I should think it a great advantage to have Sir John Pakington's name on the Bill." (3) But Milner Gibson also stood aloof, and Pakington emerged as the central figure in the negotiations. He was in communication with Cobden, Bazley, McKerrow and Richson, and by Janaury 1857 Milner Gibson was referring to the project as "Sir John Pakington's bill".

There were several important problems to be solved. The first was whether the Bill should be general and public, or private and local. The meeting on 5 December was in general in favour of the former. There were recent

---

(1) Pakington's diary, 10 December 1856.
(2) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 59-62, Pakington to Cobden, 23 November 1856.
(3) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 65, Cobden to Bazley, 6 December 1856.

important precedents including Ewart's measure for the establishment of a rate for public libraries, and Denison's Act for the better education of pauper children, but Pakington himself believed that a private and local bill would stand more chance of success. He expressed his reasons in a letter to Cobden. (1) A public bill would invite general discussion, protracted debates, being "driven from Wednesday to Wednesday, sometimes with weeks between, and if not outwitted on the merits of the question, we might be beaten, as I was beaten in 55 by efflux of time." Henley and others would doubtless refer to the defeat of Russell's resolutions and ask that the House should stand by that vote. The Government might regard with jealousy a general bill which did not emanate from the new Education Department. A private and local bill, on the other hand, would take precedence, and would be welcomed by many M.P.'s as an interesting and justifiable experiment; "Manchester United would say with a force which it would be difficult to resist - "You have refused a National Measure - let us take care of our own citizens by the Expenditure of our own funds" -."

A second problem was that of the names to be put on the back of the Bill. Cobden and Milner Gibson were the obvious N.P.S.A. representatives but neither was particularly anxious to bear the parliamentary responsibility. On the Manchester and Salford side the choice was even more difficult, as was shown by the events of 1854. Pakington suggested that if it were a local bill Milner Gibson's name should be included and perhaps his own, with Cobden's and another from the Conservative side added if it were thought necessary. For a public bill

---

(1) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 66-71, Pakington to Cobden, 9 December 1856. The quotations which follow are from this source.

Pakington preferred Cobden as the N.P.S.A. representative together with an official Government supporter, with Pakington and one of his own colleagues, Stanley, Miles, Adderley or Northcote. Even for a public bill, however, he accepted that the names of both Cobden and Milner Gibson might be included. But the chief problem was that of religious teaching. Pakington himself was "... willing to say, I have said, that I heard religious instruction in the Secular School at Manchester which, as far as it went was excellent." Pakington was not, however, happy with that religious or moral teaching, he thought it inconsistent to base such teaching on the authority of the Bible yet not to allow the Bible as such to be read in the school. His main objection, however, was that since not all children would attend Sunday school some might be denied access to the Bible altogether. But in the spirit of compromise Pakington was "ready to do justice to the good animus of the leading members of the Secular party - I am therefore willing to admit their schools together with the rest."

Others found it less easy to surrender long-cherished beliefs. McKerrow in a judicious letter (1) which appeared in the Manchester Examiner and Times of 17 December appealed for compromise and restraint, and Pakington wrote encouragingly to him on the following day. (2) But many officials and members of the N.P.S.A. struggled hard with their consciences in the winter of 1856-7, and probably none more so than R.W. Smiles. (3)

---

(1) Manchester Examiner and Times, 17 December 1856.
(2) Pakington to McKerrow, 18 December 1856. Printed in J.M. McKerrow, Memoir of William McKerrow D.D. (1881), 181-2. The opening sentence reads "I am watching with great interest the progress of your new education movement in Manchester."
(3) Smiles, the Secretary of the N.P.S.A., was the brother of Samuel Smiles, author of Self Help.

From the outset he had had doubts about the six resolutions, and did not share the view urged on reluctant N.P.S.A. members that if an act were achieved local arrangements could later be made to secure N.P.S.A. principles. He poured out his misgivings in a long letter to Cobden and concluded, "... I am troubled as to the course I ought to take - feeling that I "cannot serve two masters ". The National Public School Association will not be dissolved I believe, and I have been led to believe that the Secretaryship of the new association will be offered me. I shall quit the old with great reluctance but feel that I will be in a false position and not following an honest course if I attempt to serve both - the principles of the one have my entire sympathy, the other alone of the two appears to me to have any power to obtain practical results." (1)

Pakington in the meantime was involved in considerable correspondence and consultations, (2) and in particular was engaged in sounding out possible supporters on the Conservative side. He sent a copy of the resolutions to Northcote and received in return not only a long reply but also a copy of the seven heads of Northcote's proposed measure for the "Better Care and Education of Neglected, Vagrant and Disorderly Children and for the Extension of Industrial Schools." (3) Resolutions 2 and 5, Northcote felt, by excluding inspection of religious instruction virtually sanctioned the adoption of the secular system. No. 4 suggested

---

(1) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 72-3, Smiles to Cobden, 20 December 1856.
(2) Including some with Kay-Shuttleworth, Pakington's diary, 27 December 1856.
(3) Iddesleigh Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 50022, 248, Northcote to Pakington, 'Christmas' 1856. The enclosure, ibid., 250-1, was dated 1 December 1856.

Religious Instruction would be recognised as an 'extra', like French or Drawing in Classical schools. Northcote was in favour of rate-aided education, but he believed that it was essential to "reconcile the Rate system to the Denominational system," and not to seek a solution to the religious difficulty, - namely "that you cannot compel a man of one creed to pay a rate for the support of a school of another creed," - by excluding religion from the schools altogether.

Milner Gibson spent Christmas in Paris and declined to have correspondence forwarded to him there, though English newspapers and direct letters from Smiles kept him informed of the Manchester proceedings. He thus avoided communication with McKerrow until 8 January, (1) and it was in this letter that he refused to assent to McKerrow's request that his name should be put on the Bill until he had seen a full draft of the measure as it was to be submitted to Parliament and used the term "Sir John Pakington's bill". Milner Gibson asked difficult but pertinent questions. If purely secular schools which confined themselves to intellectual and moral instruction were to be admitted to the benefit of a rate, would Pakington and his friends agree that such schools should also receive aid from the parliamentary grants? Would they indeed support the campaign to rescind the Minute which excluded such schools? Milner Gibson and Pakington had clashed too strongly in the Commons in the past for reconciliation to be an easy matter, important issues of principle and precedence were at stake, and Milner Gibson remained cautious and aloof. A paragraph from his letter

---

(1) Milner Gibson to McKerrow, 8 January 1857. Printed in J.M. McKerrow, Memoir of William McKerrow D.D. (1881), 182-3.

to McKerrow shows his coolness. "I need scarcely say that it will be very gratifying to me to find that without compromising those principles which I think not only just but absolutely essential to the successful working of a system of rate-supported schools, our friends are able to sincerely co-operate with Sir John Pakington and his coadjutors in the cause of national education."

Milner Gibson's name was not on the back of the Bill of 1857. It remained to be seen whether the four names of Pakington, Cobden, Stanley and Headlam which did appear there would be taken to signify a broad coalition of educational groups and interests, or the collusion of four well-meaning but notoriously isolated political individualists. But whatever the status and the chances of success of the Bill of 1857, whatever comments might be made about the relative decline of educational animosity in Manchester, it must be recognized that it was Pakington who had been instrumental in bringing the representatives of the contending parties together, that Pakington had continued steadfastly to work to transform the six resolutions into a bill, and that as a result of these labours it was he who stood poised in 1857 to introduce into the Commons a measure to provide rate aid as the necessary financial basis for national education.

Chapter Five

THE BILL OF 1857

The Bill of 1857, Pakington's second attempt at a major education measure, was also the culmination of a movement for legislation which had begun in 1850 with Fox's Bill, and was renewed in 1867 with the Education of the Poor Bill, to be completed by the 1870 Act. In a sense it marked another personal triumph, for after the failed Bills of the N.P.S.A. and its supporters, after the unacceptable schemes of the Manchester and Salford Committee, after the debacle of Russell's Bills and resolutions, it was Pakington who had emerged as the parliamentary leader of an important consensus on national education. Had the Bill of 1857 been successful that place in the history of English education which has for so long been denied to Pakington would instantly have been achieved. But even though it failed Pakington still retained the educational initiative for another year when first the Palmerston and then the Derby government accepted his proposal for the establishment of a Royal Commission.

The Bill of 1857 can be seen as the most important of the parliamentary educational proposals of the decade. In 1870 it was recognized in retrospect as the distillation of the experience of a quite unparalleled period of legislative attempts, and Forster was thus entirely accurate in acknowledging the Bill of 1857 as a true parent of his own.

But Pakington's negotiations with N.P.S.A. leaders in the winter of 1856-7 had naturally aroused the suspicions of some members of the Conservative party and the condemnation of others. Henley and Cecil for example saw the compact between Pakington and the Manchester

educationists as a confirmation of their predictions and worst fears. Derby, who had been engaged in discussions with Joliffe in January on the state of the party and in particular on the need for concerted action, feared the divisive effect of Pakington's actions and wrote to Disraeli that he was "sorry to see that Pakington is hampered by his engagements with the Manchester folks on the subject of education." (1) Derby did his best to dissuade Pakington from his course and invited him to broaden his experience of Lancashire and its institutions by staying at Knowsley. Walpole was also present and Lytton stayed briefly overnight on his way back from Glasgow. Matters came to a head, Pakington reported, when "on Tuesday (2) night we had a long conversation on the subject of my position in connection with the question of Education, and the embarrassment which has been caused by Henley's strong and active opposition to my views." (3) In the course of the conversation it was brought home to Pakington that his commitments to the front bench of the Conservative opposition and to the General Committee of Education in Manchester and Salford, as the new alliance was known, might well be incompatible. When at Knowsley Pakington had not finally settled the matter of the other names to be on the Bill. The secular side of the alliance had not as yet selected their own champions, though during Pakington's Knowsley visit Stanley had agreed to his name being added on the Conservative side if it should be required. Pakington, on 21 January, now fully aware of the political implications of the course on which he was embarked felt it his duty to give Stanley a chance

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/S/140, Derby to Disraeli, 23 January 1857.
(2) Tuesday, 20 January 1857.
(3) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/29, Pakington to Disraeli, 23 January 1857.

to reconsider also. "I therefore thought it right on Wednesday morning to tell him the actual position in which I found myself, and not to accept his assent until he had reconsidered the question." (1) Stanley stood firm but the decision contributed to a turning point in his own career, and he retired to the back benches. "Since 1852 he had differed from the great majority of the party on Church rates, religious tests in Parliament, religious tests in Universities, the repeal of the newspaper stamp, the constitution of the Army, the constitution of the Civil Service, Irish and English education." (2)

On Wednesday, 21 January Pakington proceeded from Knowsley to Manchester where he expected merely an interview with Richson, but was surprised instead to find a meeting of the sub-committee deputed to prepare the Bill. Later in the day he attended a meeting of the General Committee under Bazley's chairmanship. At that meeting the heads of the Bill were adopted and it was resolved to hold, early in February, a great public meeting at which Pakington himself should speak.

Pakington was now so committed to the Manchester scheme that he had to face the possibility of retiring from the front bench and moving the Bill from another place. In fact, just as Pakington had decided that he could not withdraw from the Manchester commitment on account of the harm that it would do to the cause of national education, so Derby was also to resolve that the Conservative party must face difficulties and divisions rather than risk the loss of Pakington himself. He wrote to Disraeli, "He must not leave us, great as is the

---

(1) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 23 January 1857.
(2) W.D. Jones, Lord Derby and Victorian Conservatism (1956), 214, citing 'Disraeli Papers. Stanley XII, Stanley to Disraeli, 27 January 1857'.

inconvenience of his independent movements." (1) Disraeli concurred, and played his part in retaining Pakington's front bench services, but in a letter to Derby on 28 January declared himself to be "as sick of it (education) as the country is ... Lord John Russell's resolutions were the climax of confusion and there the curtain, for the present, ought to have fallen," whilst on the following Wednesday (2) he wrote from the Carlton Club to "return Pakingtoniana. I really have no head, at present, for this subject, so uncalled for and so inopportune." (3)

Pakington presented his case to Derby and Disraeli in two long letters written on 23 January. He wrote firstly and more fully to Derby, and enclosed with his letter the draft Bill. (4) Pakington began by announcing his decision to proceed with the Bill and recapitulated his work for education during the parliamentary sessions of 1855 and 1856, his visit to Manchester in November, his part in securing the union of contending parties, and his actions since leaving Knowsley. As to the Bill itself, Pakington commended it to Derby as ensuring that "the secular system, as a system for general adoption, is in fact abandoned." Pakington advised that he could not as an honourable man desert the cause which he had embraced, but he also recognized Derby's right, if the leader felt that the Conservative 'Cabinet' should be united on issues of major importance, to require him to withdraw from the front bench. Pakington argued, however, that the education question should be an open one, and that if there were to be divisions it might be

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/S/141, Derby to Disraeli, 25 January 1857, enclosing Pakington's letter of 23 January and the copy of the draft Bill.
(2) Wednesday, 4 February 1857.
(3) Quoted in W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1929), I, 1464.
(4) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 23 January 1857.

wise to balance opinions, with Disraeli and Lytton in support to counter the opposition of Henley and Walpole. He asked Derby to inform him of his decision by Monday, 2 February, in time to know whether he should attend Disraeli's dinner party on that evening, for it would hardly be consistent for him to do so if he were to occupy a new Commons seat on the Tuesday. This letter, one of the most important of Pakington's political career, shows vividly the conflict between Pakington's allegiances to the cause of national education and to the Conservative party.

"I think then that my duty is clear - If you are unwilling that National Education shall continue hereafter to be an open question amongst your Cabinet friends, I must retire from the front bench and move my Bill and assert my opinions from another seat -

But why should it not be an open question? Is not the balance of consideration, irrespective of my course or position, in favour of that decision? - Is it prudent for the Conservative party to repudiate all liberal and popular views upon this great subject which touches more or less, every hearth in England? - Is it for the interest of that party practically to declare that any man who adopts such views must cease to be a member of your Cabinet?"

Pakington wrote in much the same words to Disraeli, though hastily and less fully, for he hoped to see Disraeli soon in London as he was particularly anxious to settle the matter of the Monday dinner party at Grosvenor Gate. (1)

Pakington's political future hung in the balance on

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/29, Pakington to Disraeli, 23 January 1857. He enclosed the heads of the Bill.

those three days in January. (1) But he determined, if it was necessary, to sacrifice his chance of again holding ministerial office to his new found Manchester allies. He even began to consider his possible role as an independent M.P., as another Cobden, "the most eminent and the most moderate member of the secular party", or as another Shaftesbury. It is noteworthy that Pakington at the beginning of 1857 was working for educational reform in the company of Cobden, and by the end of the year was Shaftesbury's colleague in the important issue of the Ragged School Minute.

Derby replied at length on 25 January, (2) advising that he was still considering whether Pakington should move from the front bench, that if the party were in office it would be impossible to treat national education as an open question, that he himself was still opposed to the idea of a bill, that Pakington should send further copies of the draft Bill to his leading Conservative colleagues and engage in confidential discussions immediately on the meeting of Parliament, and that he should attend Disraeli's dinner party. Pakington replied immediately, (3) grateful for Derby's forbearance, but still determined to give notice of his Bill on the first day of the Session, though he would defer the motion for leave to a later time than he would otherwise have done in order to ensure time for consultation within the party. Pakington also wrote to Disraeli (4) and the latter's reply was a masterpiece of Disraelian wiles. He flattered, "Involving as it does the possible loss for me of the ablest, readiest, and most faithful of my

---

(1) 23-25 January 1857.
(2) Derby Mss. Box 183/2, Derby Letter Book, Derby to Pakington, 25 January 1857.
(3) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 26 January 1857.
(4) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/30, Pakington to Disraeli, 26 January 1857.

colleagues in the parliamentary strife," he cajoled, "secessions .... are always imputed to unworthy motives," he denigrated, "The affair is not urgent ... the country is not particularly disposed at present for its revival," he predicted "if we play our cards with dexterity and courage," the fall of the Government. Disraeli urged Pakington against an immediate notice, and assured him of a welcome at Grosvenor Gate on 2 February, "particularly as under my roof you will never meet again the grim visage of our amiable colleague Henley." (1) Derby was also taken aback by Pakington's declared intention of giving the earliest possible notice, and forwarded the letter of 26 January to Disraeli, suggesting a meeting on Monday, 2 February between the two leaders, Pakington, Lytton, Henley and Walpole, "which will either lead to an understanding or a crisis." (2)

Pakington hesitated again, but he felt obliged to give his notice on 3 February, though his motion was low on the list, scheduled for 17 February. He informed Derby (3) of his intention to proceed on or as soon after that date as he could, and began preparations not only for his Commons speech but also for the proposed preceding Conservative 'Cabinet' meeting. It is difficult to determine whether such a meeting on the Bill actually took place. Certainly the matter was not discussed in the 'Cabinet' held on 10 February when, in the absence of Disraeli and Henley, "Income Tax and China seemed sufficient for the occasion." (4) Four days

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/7/(11)/8, Disraeli to Pakington, 27 January 1857.
(2) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/S/142, Derby to Disraeli, 27 January 1857, enclosing Pakington's letter of 26 January.
(3) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 4 February 1857.
(4) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 11 February 1857. Pakington told Derby that he had "no wish to press for discussion in your cabinet unless you think it desirable."

earlier Pakington had publicly asserted his position in such a manner as to ensure that if Derby wished to retain the services of both Pakington and such potential opponents as Henley, 'Cabinet' discussions on education would best be avoided.

The public meeting held on the evening of Friday, 6 February 1857 in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, had been convened by the General Committee of Education in Manchester and Salford, and was presided over by its chairman, Thomas Bazley.[1] Pakington not only attended, but spoke in support of the most contentious of the resolutions. Other adherents appeared to be more cautious, for after Bazley had briefly opened the proceedings, Smiles, the secretary, read letters of support from friends of education, including several M.P.'s, who had been unable to attend. Even Stanley and Cobden wrote to express "hearty concurrence in the objects, and regretted that previous engagements placed it beyond their power to aid the cause with their presence on that occasion."[2]

The first resolution was moved by William Entwistle[3] and seconded by W.R. Wood. They urged that education should no longer be left to the fluctuating Minutes of the Committee of Council, but should be governed by an act of Parliament, for which all friends of national education should combine their efforts. Richson moved the second resolution which highlighted the widely-varying educational requirements of different parts of the country,

---

(1) President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, a Vice-President of the National Public School Association, and M.P. for Manchester from 1859.
(2) The Times, 9 February 1857.
(3) Former Chairman of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill Committee, and Treasurer of the new General Committee.

and called for a permissive educational measure, implementation of which would depend upon local knowledge and discretion.

Kay-Shuttleworth spoke to the third resolution, which concerned the introduction of popularly-elected local boards to administer schools which were to be financed from local rates, and had been moved by J.A. Nicholls and seconded by C.E. Cawley. (1) Kay-Shuttleworth was not a supporter of the Conservative party, Lansdowne and Russell were his particular friends and he had a strong admiration for the latter, "that great little man". (2) When eventually he himself stood for Parliament in 1874, he did so as a Gladstonian Liberal. (3) Nevertheless Kay-Shuttleworth, himself the traditional hero of nineteenth-century English education, paid the fullest tribute on this occasion to Pakington's work; "... it was mainly to the exertions of Sir J. Pakington in the last three sessions of Parliament that we owed the emancipation of this subject from the category of miserable party discussions." (4) Kay-Shuttleworth had, in the 1850's, both supported attempts at compromise and believed that eventually these would be successful. (5) He was particularly qualified not only to understand the problems of the

---

(1) Nicholls was a Unitarian, Cawley a supporter of the Established Church and a former member of the Executive Committee of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill Committee.

(2) Four Periods of Public Education (1862), was dedicated to Lansdowne and Russell.

(3) In a close contest he was defeated in North-east Lancashire by eighty-seven votes.

(4) The Times, 9 February 1857. Kay-Shuttleworth cut short his own speech because the audience, some 2,000 strong, "were all anxious to hear Sir John Pakington". Daily News, 9 February 1857.

(5) F. Smith, The Life and Works of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth (1923), 256.

politics of education in both Manchester and Westminster, but also to appreciate the dimensions of Pakington's commitment and achievement, and he praised Pakington's role in securing the agreement which had made possible the 1857 Bill.

McKerrow was due to move the fourth resolution, but previous speakers had occupied too much time, and though the meeting expressed a strong desire to hear him he declined, and thus allowed Pakington as seconder of the resolution to speak at length. (1) The essence of the long resolution was "... that this meeting considers that the only requirement pertaining to instruction which, as a condition of receiving such local aid, ought to be demanded, is a prescribed amount of secular instruction...." Pakington, as ever, found no difficulty in filling the time allotted to him. He conceded that the Bill was incomplete, "permissive, not compulsory, local, and not general," but commended it to the audience as embodying important principles which it was the duty of wise politicians to secure as soon as they could. The final resolution, moved by T.P. Bunting (2) and seconded by the Reverend W. Gaskill, called on Pakington and Cobden to "persevere in Parliament with a measure for the promotion of education based upon the principles of the resolutions."

The meeting of 6 February attracted extensive press coverage, and The Times of 9 February contained not only a lengthy account of the proceedings, (3) but also a not

---

(1) McKerrow expressed his views in two letters to the Manchester Examiner and Times, J.M. McKerrow, Memoir of William McKerrow D.D. (1881), 183.

(2) A Methodist and a Tory, and a former member of the Executive Committee of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill Committee.

(3) Pakington's speech, however, was somewhat abridged, but there were full reports in The Morning Post and Daily News. The Morning Post, 9 February 1857, entitled its account of the meeting, 'Sir John Pakington on National Education'.

unfavourable leader which concluded that the voluntary principle was the basis of the national system of education and that, "If Sir J. PAKINGTON and his friends are willing to adopt this principle, they will no doubt meet with success in their endeavours to extend the sphere of Government assistance." The meeting was also another personal triumph for Pakington. In the Free Trade Hall of Manchester, in the presence of Kay-Shuttleworth and the absence of Cobden, he, a Worcestershire country squire and member of Derby's 'Cabinet', was acclaimed as the leader of the movement for national education. Kay-Shuttleworth, according to The Times (and the Daily News confirms the impression) was received with "much applause" and concluded to "cheers", Pakington stood up to "loud cheers" and sat down to "great cheering".

The Education (Cities and Boroughs) Bill, (1) a lengthy document of some seventy-seven clauses and six schedules, was broadly divided into seven sections; Adoption of the Act (Clauses I - VII), Election of Members of the School Committee (VIII - XXXIII), Union of the Schools with the Committee (XXXIV - LII), Inspection of the Schools (LIII - LIX), Payment of the Fees (LX - LXV), Raising the Fund required for the Purposes of the Act (LXVI - LXXII), and Interpretation of Words (LXXIII - LXXVII).

In "corporate cities and boroughs" in which at least 1/100 of the persons assessed for poor rate so petitioned the Mayor, a referendum should be held on whether to adopt

---

(1) P.P. 1857, i, 95-128, A Bill to promote Education in Corporate Cities and Boroughs in England and Wales. If successful it would have been known as 'The Borough Education Act, 1857'.

the Act. If the proposal were rejected another vote could not be taken until a further year had elapsed. Those assessed for poor rate would be entitled to vote in the referendum and in the election of the School Committees, whilst the Committee's membership would be restricted to those with a property of rateable value of not less than £20 p.a. Voting would be by secret ballot. In cities and boroughs of less than 50,000 inhabitants School Committees would consist of twelve persons, for those with 50 - 100,000 inhabitants there would be eighteen members, with a maximum of twenty-four for those in excess of 100,000 population. One third of the Committee's members would retire each year, meetings would be held at least monthly, and Committees were required to keep minutes and empowered to appoint such officers as they deemed necessary.

There was no specific provision under the Bill for the creation of new schools. Schools to be admitted into union with the Committees were to be those where fees were paid up to a maximum of 4d. a week. This also included schools where some, or indeed none, of the children paid fees. Schools which were refused admission into union had the right of appeal to the Committee of Council. Schools and their registers were to be always open to inspection, and teachers must be qualified, with at least one such teacher for every eighty pupils or one pupil teacher to forty pupils.

Eleven regulations governing the schools admitted into union were set out in Clause XL, and the fifth contained the Bill's solution to the religious difficulty.

"XL (5). That if any distinctive Religious Formulary be taught in the School, the Time when such Teaching shall take place shall be fixed by the Trustees or Managers of the said School; and every Change in such Time which shall be made by the said Trustees or Managers shall be in like Manner openly set forth in the Table; and in the

Case of any Child whose Parent or Guardian shall express a Wish, either in a personal Interview with the Trustees or Managers or the principal Teacher of the School, or in some Document signed by such Parent or Guardian, that the Child shall not be so taught the same, but shall be set to some other Instruction, or shall be allowed to leave the School, during the Time that such Formulary is being Taught." This was reinforced by the sixth regulation which stated that no child as a condition of admission into, or continuance at a school or participation in any special benefits therein, should be required to attend or abstain from, a particular school or place of worship on Sunday or other holy days.

This solution was clearly in accordance with the system of King Edward's Birmingham, and reflected Pakington's long championship of its merits. But although this compromise would seem to indicate substantial concession on behalf of the secular party, indeed the very abandonment of "the secular system as a system for general adoption," (1) as Pakington had urged on Derby, the seventh regulation, whilst ostensibly seeking to provide that broad curriculum for which both Pakington and Milner Gibson had separately striven, also clearly countenanced the existence of secular schools. For it declared, "That where Children above the Age of Seven Years shall be received in the School, the general Course of Instruction therein shall include the following Subjects: Reading, Writing, English Grammar, Arithmetic, Geography, English History, as well as Book-Keeping for the Boys, and Needlework for the Girls."

Other regulations in this section gave unrestricted access for pupils to any school within the Union provided there were sufficient places, though in an effort to

---

(1) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 23 January 1857.

secure regular attendance it was stipulated that schools were not bound to retain any child who failed to attend for four days in each week or sixteen complete days in four successive weeks. On the issue of inspection each Committee was to have at least one local inspector, and annual or more frequent inspection of each school was required, although inspection by an H.M.I. could count for this purpose.

There were detailed arrangements for the disbursement of grants, and provision was made for special cases, e.g. the payment of fees of children and young persons covered by the factory acts, for a minimum of twelve hours schooling at a rate of 3d. per boy and 2½d. per girl per week. Arrangements were made for the payment of 2d. per week for other part-time scholars who completed six hours evening attendance. But the basis of the financial provision was for day schools and was contained in Clause LXI. The School Committee was required to make payment to the school managers or trustees on the following rate; "... that is to say, for every Boy above the Age of Seven Years, not being a Free Scholar, the Sum of Threepence and One Halfpenny, in respect of his Attendance at the said School in each Week during the preceding Quarter as aforesaid; and for every Girl above that Age, not being a Free Scholar, the Sum of Threepence in respect of each Week as aforesaid; and for every Infant between the Ages of Four and Seven, not being a Free Scholar, the Sum of Twopence; and in respect of Free Scholars admitted according to the Provisions of this Act, the Rates shall be for every Boy above Seven Years of Age Sixpence for each Week, for every Girl above that Age Fivepence, and for every Infant as above Fourpence." At least three-quarters of the money so received by the school managers or trustees was to be applied to the payment of teachers' salaries.

All money was to be raised by the simple expedient of the School Committee making orders upon the overseers of the poor of the several parishes within the city or borough, to contribute such sums of money out of the poor rate as the Committee required.

Pakington moved the first reading of the Education (Cities and Boroughs) Bill on 18 February. (1) His aim was to show the extreme reasonableness and spirit of concession which pervaded the measure. Inasmuch as Russell's resolutions of the previous year which declared that education should be compulsory and general had been rejected by the House, the Bill would be permissive and local. He cited as examples of permissive legislation, Ewart's Act which permitted corporate towns to raise rates to establish libraries, and the Act of 1839 which enabled counties to adopt an improved police system. (2) Cities and corporate towns only had been included, not because they were more deficient in educational provision than other areas, but because their boundaries were already drawn and fresh machinery for defining the groupings for the operation of the Act would not be required. Moreover such a restriction would be supported by many who wished for a genuine experiment in rate-aided education before committing themselves to a general system.

Pakington refrained from proving yet again the extent of general educational deficiency, but he naturally referred to the situation in Manchester, and to the testimony of both McKerrow and Richson as to the numbers of children there who did not attend school. Pakington now proclaimed "that so far as the great locality of

---

(1) Hansard, CXLIV, 776-85, 18 February 1857.
(2) This was an interesting example, since compulsion had been introduced in 1856.

Manchester is concerned, this combination of the religious and the secular party is effected, and this Bill that I seek to introduce I have prepared with the co-operation of a large committee consisting of a very able body of men, and comprising an equal number of those two parties, who, I am thankful to say, are now cordially acting together on this subject ... The principles which I desire to establish in this Bill are three. The first, religious freedom and toleration; the second, that there should be local contribution to the support of an object which is interesting to every home in England; and the third is, that following out the principle of all our most important institutions, there should be local management and control of the funds so raised for the local school." (1) Pakington explained how the compromise on the religious issue had been reached, assured the House that the new rate would be merely in aid of the existing system, in the sense that school pence and Privy Council grants would continue, that there was no intention of threatening either the current management of schools, nor their existence by the general establishment of free schools, and that if the House would approach the Bill in a "calm and dispassionate spirit ... we may hope ere long to arrive at a practical solution of this great and important question." (2)

At first sight Pakington's speech does not seem to have been of special importance. It was, particularly for him, relatively short, yet it lacked coherence and a single theme. His summary of the provisions of the Bill was not illuminating, and as The Times commented with some justification, "... neither its proposer nor any of his friends seem to know exactly themselves what it is; at least if they do know, they have not the art

---

(1) Ibid., 780-1.
(2) Ibid., 784-5.

of expressing themselves clearly." (1) But this speech was of the utmost significance, for it showed in a completely new sense not only the spirit of compromise, but a practical plan for the first instalment of a programme of national education, based on the reality of the existing school situation, on an appreciation of the nature of English nineteenth-century legislative reform, and of the political need to conciliate opposing groups.

Pakington's own concessions were considerable. He was himself by 1857 a firm believer in the ultimate necessity of compulsory, general, free education, but in the interest of securing a first step he was introducing a permissive and specifically limited measure which made no provision for the establishment of new or free schools. Pakington believed emphatically that "religion ought to be mixed up with the whole system of training from infancy, and that it can never be with safety entirely put aside," (2) and yet he was prepared to agree to the specific timetabling of religious instruction in denominational schools, and to admit both the grotesque results of much rote teaching of the Catechism, and the claims of secular schools to a share in rate aid. He was prepared to admit, moreover, the concessions which the secular party had made; "... the secular party have withdrawn the language which my right hon. Friend Milner Gibson broadly held two years ago - that no national system could ever be adopted until it was arranged that every school in the country should be a secular school." (3) In recognition of this concession Pakington, who had been impressed by the religious zeal of such men as McKerrow, now accepted Cobden's judgement "that the difference between the religious and the secular party is not so

---

(1) The Times, 20 February 1857.
(2) Hansard, CXLIV, 782, 18 February 1857.
(3) Ibid., 781.

much a difference of principle as a difference of time and place." (1)

Cobden seconded the motion without a speech and fittingly it was Cowper (2) who spoke next on behalf of the Government. (3) He urged the House to give the matter full consideration, and to meet Pakington in the same conciliatory spirit as he had shown in framing the Bill. Cowper cited a third example of permissive legislation, the Public Health Act, praised Pakington's three principles, to which he thought "no reasonable objection could be taken," and commended the permissive principle and its application to large urban areas only in the first instance. He thus welcomed both the proposal for permissive local rating and Pakington's assurance that there would be no interference with the management of existing schools. Cowper urged that the master of a denominational school should not be prevented from giving doctrinal instruction to those pupils of the same denomination whose parents so desired it, but refrained from giving any specific dictum on the matter of religious teaching until he had seen the details of the Bill. Even here, however, he was conciliatory, "... to enact that a master should not teach a particular formulary; or that it should be taught at a particular time and under certain conditions, was a much less objectionable arrangement." (4) Whilst Cowper could clearly not commit the Government until the Bill was printed his general attitude was encouraging, and he offered no opposition to the principle of a bill.

---

(1) Ibid., 782.
(2) William Francis Cowper (1811-1888), Cowper-Temple from 1869. Nephew of Lord Melbourne and stepson to Palmerston, he became Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education in February 1857.
(3) Hansard., CXLIV, 785-8, 18 February 1857.
(4) Ibid., 786.

Russell's reaction was also favourable. (1) He thanked Pakington for bringing the subject of national education again before the House, and commended his prudence in making the Bill merely "permissive and local" although Russell shared Pakington's view that eventually it was essential "to render national education general and compulsory." Russell defended Pakington against Henley's charge (2) that he had made dangerous concessions to the secular party, and praised the Seculars for their concession that religious teaching should be supported from the rates, provided that religious liberty was also guaranteed. Russell concluded by asking that "no hon. Gentleman will raise a prejudice against a scheme intended by its author as a concession to objections which he does not himself feel, but by conciliating which he hopes to be able to take a step towards the attainment of a proper system of national education. For my own part, I heartily wish the right hon. Gentleman every success, and sincerely trust that he may be able to obviate the objections to which his scheme is liable." (3)

Ewart, who made reference to the work of the Liverpool Corporation schools, also spoke in favour of the Bill, (4) and hoped that "when the good effects of the system had been shown in one or two instances, it would be adopted generally throughout the country." He emphasized the need for all parties to unite in a conciliatory spirit for a system of national education which was essential both to the prosperity of the nation and for the improvement of the conditions of its people.

Hadfield, Henley and Cecil spoke in different vein, but inasmuch as they were unaware of the Bill's details their speeches lacked substance, and their attempts at generating passion and prejudice by the repetition of

---

(1) Ibid., 796-9.
(2) Ibid., 793-6.
(3) Ibid., 799.
(4) Ibid., 800-1.

entirely predictable eloquence rang hollow in the general atmosphere of reasonableness and conciliation. Thus Hadfield [1] deplored the failure to mention either Sunday schools or the increase in literature, and criticized Pakington who "now suddenly turned round and threw himself into the arms of the secular party," and claimed to have settled the education question "in a two hours interview." When Pakington protested that he had made no such claim, Hadfield was reduced to raising the spectre of Roman Catholic schools on the rates. [2]

Henley [3] raised five major objections. The first was that the opposition to Russell's resolutions was not merely on the grounds of their being general and compulsory, but rather that which would be afforded to any scheme which threatened to sap, and ultimately to destroy, the existing system of education. He secondly maintained that religious teaching must pervade the whole of the school, and not merely be confined to a half hour or an hour like a Maths or French lesson. Thirdly, there was no specific provision in the Bill for the creation of new schools. Fourthly, that Pakington had on the issue of religious teaching deferred to the views of supporters of the secular system, and finally that an ignorant man could be as good a Christian as an educated one. He concluded by expressing the hope that when the Bill was printed it would not realise his fears, but if it were to do so he would present his "warmest opposition". Pakington, in a brief comment on Henley's speech, advised that the Bill was primarily concerned to maintain established schools, that no schools would be forced to come into union with the School Committees,

---

(1) Ibid., 799-800.
(2) On 6 February at Manchester Pakington had claimed that the problem "was solved by seven or eight gentlemen, in a discussion that did not occupy two hours." Daily News, 9 February 1857.
(3) Hansard, CXLIV, 793-6, 18 February 1857.

and that whereas it was quite true that the humblest person had full access to divine truth, it was widely held "that the intellectual ignorance and moral debasement of a portion of our population are found to be the great barriers to the teaching of religion in such classes." (1)

Pakington thus dealt confidently with Henley's speech, but the most fortunate development on 18 February was the ill-judged opposition of Cecil. (2) He rightly characterized the Bill as the "thin end of the wedge," but declared that his fundamental "objection to this measure was, that its supporters were too hasty, that they were in too great a hurry, and would not allow the existing system to be sufficiently tried." (3) This stung Cobden into urgent reply. (4) He stated that whilst it normally took some seven years of agitation to secure a political reform, "This measure of education has to my knowledge had three seven years (5) of discussion in this House." Cobden, who referred to the measure as Pakington's Bill, cited the example of King Edward's Birmingham, and of middle-class schools in London and Middlesex, in which the religious difficulties had been simply circumvented by designating a certain period in the day for denominational instruction. Cobden concluded that there had not been "any scheme submitted to the House more likely to meet with general acquiescence than that which the right hon. Baronet has proposed." (6) Pakington also took the opportunity of putting Cecil in his place, and advised him "that when he thinks proper on any future occasion to allude to me in debate, that he will make a memorandum of what I have said, because he has so altered

---

(1) Ibid., 802.
(2) Ibid., 789-90.
(3) Ibid., 789.
(4) Ibid., 790-3.
(5) Twenty-one years.
(6) Ibid., 793.

every portion of the speech to which he has referred that I by no means am willing to accept the opinions which are imputed to me." (1)

The first reading was thus distinctly promising. Cecil and Hadfield had blustered to little purpose, and Henley had as yet found no specific principle, actually contained in the Bill, to oppose. Encouraging responses from Cowper, Russell, Ewart and Cobden boded well. There were other hopeful signs. On 9 February, in very similar vein, Sir George Grey (2) had introduced a Reformatory Schools Bill, a permissive measure which would enable counties and boroughs to establish and aid reform schools which had hitherto relied on voluntary contributions. On the next day, 10 February, Northcote introduced his Bill for industrial schools. This sought to make "better provision for the care and education of vagrant, destitute and disorderly children, and for the extension of industrial schools," (3) and was based on Dunlop's Act which already applied to Scotland. This Bill was brought in by Northcote, Adderley and Headlam. Pakington's Bill, limited, permissive and based on the poor rate, might well be swept along in this train, and indeed, to look forward to August 1857, by that month a Reformatory Schools Bill and an Industrial Schools Bill received the Royal Assent.

In the last two weeks of February, however, Pakington's relationships with the Conservative leadership caused him much disquiet. There had been no speech from the Conservative benches in his support on the first reading, and on 27 February Pakington was distressed and embarrassed by Derby's failure to make his own position clear. Walpole

---

(1) Ibid., 801.
(2) Hansard, CXLIV, 418, 9 February 1857.
(3) Hansard, CXLIV, 474, 10 February 1857.

and Disraeli had urged Pakington to continue in his normal Commons place, and both had promised to consult Derby on Pakington's behalf. In the event, however, as Pakington discovered to his dismay, Disraeli had left the matter to Walpole and Walpole had done nothing. On 3 March Pakington accordingly wrote urgently to Derby for "tomorrow my Bill stands for second reading, and before tomorrow my course must be decided." (1)

But the Industrial Schools Bill, a measure strongly supported by Pakington, took precedence on 4 March, and it was 4 o'clock before its second reading was approved. Pakington had considered pressing on, but now he decided to postpone the second reading of his own Bill until the following Wednesday. Cobden concurred in this plan. Their opponents, notably Henley and Hadfield, were concerned not to be outmanoeuvred. Henley wished merely to ensure that due notice would be given of the time for the actual resumption of the debate, but Hadfield, with a fistful of petitions to present, was not to be denied. He not only presented these but required the Clerk to read three of them at the table. The Clerk began by reading a petition from Manchester, and was proceeding to a second, before Adderley rose to question the validity of this procedure. (2) Hadfield's intention, inasmuch as he had been deprived of the opportunity to make his prepared speech, was to suggest "that there was a very strong feeling in the country against the measure." (3)

The truth of that assertion was not put fully to the test, for in the event the Bill of 1857 was overcome not by its enemies but by the action of one of its sponsors. On 3 March the Commons reached the fourth and final night of the debate on Cobden's resolutions

---

(1) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 3 March 1857.
(2) Though this was not the accustomed practice, Hadfield was technically within his rights in asking for the petitions to be read.
(3) Hansard, CXLIV, 1876, 4 March 1857.

regarding the conduct of the war with China. Palmerston's government was defeated by 263 votes to 247, Parliament was dissolved on 21 March, (1) and the ensuing election resulted in a personal Palmerstonian triumph. The peace party, Cobden, Milner Gibson and W.J. Fox amongst them, were soundly defeated at the polls, (2) and this obvious discomfiture of Manchester Radicalism halted the whole concept of a parliamentary alliance for national education.

Pakington wished to continue the education debate, although he saw little point in reintroducing the Bill into the new Parliament. Had he originally pressed for an earlier day, however, and secured a second reading, or even a favourable commencement, he might have thought otherwise. But he wrote despondently to Cobden, "only Governments can pass Bills introduced in May, and to bring in a Bill with the certainty of failure, is not, I think, the most convenient manner of obtaining discussion." (3) Two other possibilities were open. The first was to move for a Committee or Commission of Inquiry, but Pakington was reluctant to do so for fear that this would merely postpone matters for a further year. He inclined instead to moving resolutions, "not full of details like Lord John's - not wordy and diffuse like Lord Brougham's - but short in form, concise in language, and clear in principle." (4) Pakington's intention was to prepare the way for the introduction of a further bill in 1858. He hoped that if the House could agree to some principle, for example to the advisability of a permissive,

---

(1) The new Parliament assembled on 30 April.
(2) As was John Bright.
(3) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 111-14, Pakington to Cobden, 21 April 1857. Pakington reiterated this view in the Commons, "... he thought it would be quite useless for any private Member to attempt independent legislation this Session." Hansard, CXLV, 264, 14 May 1857.
(4) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 111-14, Pakington to Cobden, 21 April 1857.

experimental measure, then either the Government, [1] or he personally, would be well poised for legislation in the next session. Pakington's resolutions, in fact, were nothing more nor less than an outline of the 1857 Bill, and he sent a copy to Cobden on 10 May. Cobden's personal preference had been for one composite resolution, and on 14 May Pakington informed the House that though he would not reintroduce the Bill he would move an education resolution. [2] Further consultations with Cobden and Russell confirmed Pakington in his view that it would be better to move a single resolution rather than the dozen or so which he had originally drawn up. [3] He prepared the way, then changed his mind and reverted to the alternative plan, a Committee or Commission. From his change of mind stemmed both the Newcastle Commission and, indirectly, the Revised Code.

The failure of the 1857 Bill marked a turning point in Pakington's attitude towards the best means of promoting national education, and was consequently a turning point in the history of English education. The immediate reason for this was Pakington's refusal to reintroduce the Bill into the new Parliament, a refusal based upon his conviction that insufficient time remained to secure the passage of an independent bill, and upon the loss at the polls of Cobden and other potential supporters from the secular side. It could be argued, however, that even without these two developments the Bill stood little chance of success. Throughout the decade the Commons had been the graveyard of educational

---

(1) Problems in China and India, however, would focus attention abroad.

(2) This part of Pakington's reply to Slaney's question was omitted from The Times report, and from Hansard, though it appeared in other papers, and was confirmed by Pakington in a letter to Cobden. Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 134-5, Pakington to Cobden, 20 May 1857.

(3) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 145-6, Pakington to Cobden, 22 May 1857.

measures, and in 1856 there had been a decisive rejection of Russell's resolutions. Pakington himself had to confess that he was introducing a Bill which contained proposals in which he did not fully believe. Moreover, the Bill was not tightly drawn, there were loopholes and variations of interpretation, arrangements had been made quickly and, as the events of 1870 would show, the framing of compromise educational legislation was a matter which demanded much time and patience. It was not clear from the first reading whether even Pakington and Cobden would place precisely the same construction upon the issue of religious teaching, and the fine distinction which Pakington tried to draw between the direct application of funds to religious teaching and the application of funds to denominationally-controlled schools was one which Russell, for example, could not accept. It was quite possible that cracks would appear in the alliance, for though Pakington had great respect for Cobden, there were differences of principle between them. There would be opponents enough, too, to exploit any divisions. There had been no speech in Pakington's support from the Conservative front bench on 18 February, and Henley and Hadfield were clearly ready, on the second reading, to launch a major attack on the Bill.

Thus it is not surprising that Pakington's Bill of 1857 has been considered to be of little significance. V.G. Toms in his important study of the secular movement summarized it thus. "Yet again Pakington introduced a bill, this time based upon the Association's plan and the Committee's scheme, with the contentious bits left out. Brought forward in February 1857 without enthusiasm, it was never really launched. In any case, the dissolution of parliament in March and the defeat of the radicals in the General Election ended the bill and the effective life of the N.P.S.A." (1)

---

(1) V.G. Toms, 'Secular education in England 1800-1870', London University Ph.D. thesis, 1972, 319.

Nevertheless the Bill of 1857 was important. Whatever qualifications are made, the bringing together of educational reformers who had hitherto been in direct opposition, and the production of a compromise Bill, were significant achievements. The Daily News, in a prophetic first leader, predicted that when ultimately prejudice should give place to reason there would undoubtedly occur "the adoption by the British legislature of some measure founded on the principles which form the basis of Sir J. PAKINGTON'S Bill." (1) There was an encouraging reception on the first reading, and though some Conservatives would be firmly opposed, Pakington was prepared to sacrifice his political future in the cause, and Derby and Disraeli to make concessions rather than to allow him to do so. Moreover, a Whig Government which only a year earlier had accepted one of Pakington's proposals for education might well be persuaded to accept another. The introduction of a limited, permissive measure as a means of experiment, might well reflect the temper of a House troubled by foreign affairs, and wearied by education debates and conflicting accounts of the statistics of schooling. But when even Pakington, though temporarily, abandoned the struggle for legislation and turned instead to the expedient of a Commission to investigate the true state of education, the House followed him. Pakington hoped thereby to convince the Government and the country of the validity of his judgements. In the event the very opposite occurred.

Though the parliamentary session had closed disappointingly for Pakington, his personal prestige as an educational champion had reached another peak in 1857. Contacts made and renewed during the Manchester discussions earlier in the year, led him in November to the first

---

(1) Daily News, 19 February 1857.

annual prizegiving of the East Lancashire Union of Mechanics' Institutions, a union of some ten institutes in the Burnley area, sponsored by Kay-Shuttleworth. Others in attendance on that occasion included Cowper and Bishop Prince Lee. (1)

Nearer home in Birmingham, in the second week of October, there had taken place the inaugural meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. (2) Lord Brougham, (3) the founder, gave the presidential address in the Town Hall on 12 October when the impressive platform party included Pakington, Russell, Stanley, Cowper, Adderley, Milnes, Scholefield, Slaney, Pillans and Sturge. The Secretary, G.W. Hastings, also read from a long list of apologies from those unable to attend, who included Kay-Shuttleworth, Bright and F.D. Maurice. There were five departments, with Russell presiding over Jurisprudence and Law, Stanley over Public Health and Pakington over Education. The Times adopted a condescending attitude from the start, "... neither Lord Brougham nor Lord John Russell, neither Sir J. Pakington nor Lord Stanley, can say anything about education which has not been said a thousand times before ... Education and sanitary reform are interesting subjects,

---

(1) Manchester Guardian, 6 November 1857.
(2) For an introduction to the Association's work for education see R.E. Aldrich, 'Association of Ideas: the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science', History of Education Society Bulletin, XVI, 1975. Cowper presided over the Education department in 1858, Adderley in 1859, and Kay-Shuttleworth in 1860.
(3) The Birmingham meeting and the N.A.P.S.S. provided a notable link between the careers of Brougham and Pakington, two of the greatest parliamentary champions of education. For Brougham's career see his Autobiography, and the works by Aspinall (1927), Hawes (1957) and New (1961). On education see R.E. Aldrich, 'Education and the Political Parties, 1830-1870', London University M.Phil thesis, 1970, Ch.II; and A.M. Gilbert, 'The work of Lord Brougham for education in England', Pennsylvania University Ph.D. thesis, 1922. There is a copy of Gilbert's thesis in the British Library.

but the capture of Delhi is more pressing." (1) Nevertheless, Pakington's connection with the N.A.P.S.S. which culminated in 1871 when he acceded to the presidency of the Association, was important not only in his work for education, but also in his general appreciation of the requirements of social reform. Moreover the choice of Pakington to preside over the Education department was a further indication of the prestige which he now enjoyed. As J.A. St. John wrote, "Sir John Pakington has completely identified himself with the subject of education, insomuch that, wherever the word is pronounced, his name is irresistibly suggested. In the National Association this department, therefore, has been very properly appropriated to him; and from the earnestness and vigour of his character, we may safely infer that he will do all that can be done towards investing it with popular interest." (2)

Pakington used his inaugural address as President of the Education department for three purposes. (3) He firstly outlined the role which the new Association might play in the cause of education. Since the legislature was overwhelmed with business, it had little time for general debates, but confined itself to the consideration of matters which were presented in "a distinct and practical shape". The Association might thus prepare the way for legislation by its papers and discussions, and by applying "gentle pressure" on Parliament. Pakington deplored the fact that the much vaunted British Parliament was unable to find its way around the religious problem, and thus

---

(1) The Times, 13 October 1857.
(2) J.A. St. John, The Education of the People (1858), 285.
(3) This speech was widely reported and The Times, 14 October 1857, included a lengthy account. It was subsequently printed in Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Birmingham Meeting 1857 (1858), 36-43.

denied its people the blessings of education so widely enjoyed in other countries.

His second theme was a review of the existing state of education and of its problems. Masses of the people were still steeped in ignorance and crime, "...injustice was done to the working classes in this matter. Their social affections were as strong as ours." Thus did Pakington reaffirm his belief in the value of education. The quality of existing provision must be improved, and new schools provided where necessary. At present there was "only half a system". Though this comprised "a Minister of State responsible to the House of Commons for the Department of Education, a body of able inspectors and annual Parliamentary grants," it lacked local organization and a permanent source of local finance. As Pakington pointed out, the increasing size of the annual parliamentary grant for education was causing concern, not least to Gladstone, and the question would rightly be asked whether, "we were deriving full value for our money."

Finally Pakington passed to his two solutions. "The legislature ought promptly to grant a permissive Bill fairly to try the experiment of improved schools in some localities, and Parliament also to allow (what he had intended to ask for in the late session had time allowed) a careful inquiry into the whole of this subject, by means of which they might be enabled in a condensed and unanswerable shape to lay before the country the real merits of this question." It later became the practice for the Secretary of the N.A.P.S.S. to announce at the beginning of each annual conference the measures which had been achieved as the result of the Association's efforts during the preceding year. Though Pakington's experimental bill did not materialize his "careful inquiry" did.

For the rest of the week Pakington conducted his department with enthusiasm and good humour. The papers were divided into four groups, national education,

endowments for educational purposes, middle-class education, and miscellaneous. During the discussions which followed the papers Pakington allowed five minutes per speaker, and when that time was exceeded, as Pakington said, "up went his watch and down went the speaker." The Reverend Bull of Birmingham had the temerity to mention that Pakington's own five minutes was nearly half an hour, but as Brougham observed, in this instance "the Sovereign is above the law".

Finally in December 1857 Pakington took part in apparently securing another change of Government policy in relation to education. Mary Carpenter, an ardent worker for the Ragged School cause summarized it thus; "... an influential deputation, headed by Sir John Pakington and Lord Shaftesbury, waited on the President of the Council to present a Memorial from the Managers of Ragged Schools in various large towns in the Kingdom. This Memorial set forth the class of children contemplated by Ragged Schools, the inadmissibility of such children to ordinary schools, even if paid for, the success of Ragged Schools in reaching and influencing them for good, their exclusion from the benefits of the recent Minute, and the earnest prayer of the Managers that some adequate aid should be given.

The appearance of another Minute on the 31st of the same month, in answer to the prayer of the Memorial, was hailed with great satisfaction, as it distinctly recognized Ragged Schools as an integral part of the educational system of the country." (1)

---

(1) M. Carpenter, The Claims of Ragged Schools to pecuniary educational aid from the annual parliamentary grant (1859), 9. This was based on a paper read by Miss Carpenter to the Education department of the N.A.P.S.S. at Liverpool in 1858. Cowper, who was then presiding, warned however that if too much aid were given to Ragged Schools children would be attracted away from fee paying elementary schools.

Pakington's interest in such schools was part of his concern for the provision of education for the poorest classes of society, and for the important mission of rescuing the perishing. His place at the head of the deputation was not surprising in view of his prestige in 1857. Moreover at Birmingham and at Burnley he had appeared on the same platforms as Cowper, and indeed, as the man who had created the Vice-Presidency itself, his patronage was keenly sought. Pakington's connection with the Ragged School movement and its effects upon his attitudes to Lowe and the Revised Code will be considered later, but the situation of 1856-7 can be briefly summarized.

There was a strong feeling in many quarters that 'Ragged Schools were a disgrace to the country'. The Minute of 2 June 1856 therefore cancelled all existing Minutes relating to ragged or reformatory schools, and henceforth provided aid only where schools were industrial in character and their scholars "taken exclusively from the criminal or abandoned classes." (1) Lingen, in an explanatory circular to inspectors advised that this requirement must be strictly adhered to, for "It has been known to happen that a ragged school, by the offer of food, has emptied a neighbouring day school, where the parents of the children were previously paying for their instruction; such a result is an unmixed evil." (2)

As a result apparently of the representations of the deputation, the Minute of 31 December 1857 cancelled that of 2 June 1856, withdrew aid from reformatory schools, (3)

---

(1) Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education (1856-7), 17.
(2) Ibid., 20, Circular dated July 1856.
(3) In fact, as Cowper explained in the Commons, no new Reformatory Schools had received grants under the Minute of June 1856 for some months, and notice had been given that all grants would soon cease. Reformatory Schools could, however, now seek grants both from the Home Office and from borough and county rates. Hansard, CXLVIII, 460, 10 December 1857.

except for the training of teachers, and set forth conditions for aiding certified ragged and industrial schools. Though the new Minute appeared to give an important status to ragged schools, disillusionment amongst the supporters of the movement soon set in, and Pakington found himself leading a campaign for its amendment which led to an important conflict of principle with Robert Lowe. For the Minute of 1857, apparently occasioned by the representations of the deputation, was prompted rather by the Committee of Council's reappraisal of the grant system in the light of the legislation of that session for reformatory and industrial schools. The object of the new Minute was not to emphasize the importance of ragged schools, but rather to withdraw the Committee of Council from the field occupied by the Home Office in relation to reformatories, and to transform ragged schools, organized as asylums or refuges, into certified industrial schools. Lingen summed up this policy in an important circular to inspectors of parochial union schools. "Ragged schools are to be regarded as provisional institutions, which are constantly tending to become either elementary schools of the ordinary kind, or industrial schools certified under Acts of Parliament." (1) Pakington himself would probably have found little to quarrel with in that judgement. He did not share Shaftesbury's unquestioning commitment to ragged schools.

---

(1) Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education (1857-8), 14, Circular dated 30 January 1858.

The year of 1857 had been for Pakington, and education, a year of decision. His commitment to the Manchester alliance, his leadership of the education cause in Parliament, his abandonment of the mode of proceeding by bill or resolution in favour of that of inquiry, were all important choices of policy. Similarly, his adherence to the N.A.P.S.S. and to the Ragged School movement which began in this year, were later to involve him in significant educational and political confrontations. But 1857 was also a peak year for Pakington's commitment to education. For in 1858 there occurred, almost simultaneously, the two events which alone could divert his interest, a new Conservative government, in which he was to play a leading role, and the appointment of his Commission of Inquiry into the state of popular education.

Chapter Six

THE NEWCASTLE COMMISSION AND THE REVISED CODE, 1858-1862

By the end of 1857 Pakington was "weary of struggles and conflicts which had impeded every attempt to carry any measure through Parliament." (1) He was still convinced of the need for legislation on the education question, but he now accepted the impossibility of achieving it without a government bill. His purpose, therefore, was to convince public opinion in general, and particularly opinion within Parliament and more especially within the Cabinet, that his interpretation of the situation was correct. He thus began to put his Bills of 1855 and 1857 into a new perspective, and declared that, although they had not succeeded, indeed, had stood no chance of success, "My object was to obtain a declaration of Parliament on certain principles, and to put into shape the views which I myself entertained upon the question." (2) Whether Pakington, as he stated in 1858, "was always conscious of the difficulties of the question, and never supposed that hon. Members would pass those Bills into a law," (3) is more difficult to accept. If that statement is taken at its face value it renders even more remarkable his willingness to jeopardize his position within the Conservative party in the educational cause.

Pakington's decision to move for a Royal Commission, therefore, should not be seen merely as stemming from the loss of the Bill of 1857. For example, in 1855 he drew attention to two areas in which there was a need for urgent inquiry. One of these was the provision of an

---

(1) Speech to the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution, The Times, 1 November 1862. See also the account in The Scotsman of the same date.
(2) Hansard, CXLVIII, 1194, 11 February 1858.
(3) Ibid.

efficient teaching force. Pakington believed that the Committee of Council had dealt with this issue in a very haphazard way; "... the masters are so overtrained that they are, in too many cases, above educational duties, and they take to other pursuits ... we ought to have the means of Parliamentary inquiry into these matters." (1) Pakington's other concern was accurately to determine the numbers of children who regularly attended good schools. Horace Mann, for example, in the 1851 Census had made a deduction from the possible school attendance of one million children whom he thought could or should be at work. Pakington was unwilling to allow that deduction, he believed that "children ought not to be allowed to work before they are educated." (2) Only such an inquiry, Pakington thought, could reveal the true dimensions of the education problem.

In the following year, 1856, during the Supply debate, Pakington asked firstly for a Government bill, secondly promised that if that were not forthcoming he should himself introduce one for them, and thirdly declared that "If all the evidence to which I have adverted has failed to convince the House of the necessity of dealing with the question, let us have a Committee of inquiry - let us bring together gentlemen from all parts of England, who thoroughly understand the question, to state personally to us their experience and views upon it. Let the House grant such a Committee, and I am confident such a Report will be produced as will force conviction upon Parliament that this great and important subject requires to be firmly and speedily dealt with." (3) Pakington seemed certain that once the facts were fully investigated a remedy of the type which he envisaged, namely the supplementation of the existing system by the support or

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 645, 16 March 1855.
(2) Ibid., 648.
(3) Hansard, CXLII, 1358-9, 12 June 1856.

outright provision of schooling in deprived areas by popularly-elected local boards, on the principles of local finance and religious toleration, would be secured by government legislation. He had already, for example, convinced Russell of the validity of his investigations, statistics and proposed remedies for securing national education, whilst Russell's party had, on Pakington's initiative and with Russell's encouragement, produced in 1856 an Education Act.

By 1857 Pakington was making, unwisely perhaps in some respects, a comparison with the Poor Law situation of the early 1830's, indeed he came to see the two cases "as closely parallel as it is possible to conceive", (1) and it is significant that the 1857 Bill was based upon Poor Law finance. One result of this identification was that by 1857 Pakington was thinking in terms of a Royal Commission rather than a Select Committee. Thus on 31 July of that year Pakington asked Palmerston for an opportunity to bring forward a motion for "an Address to the Crown for the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry on the subject of Education." (2) Some consultation with Ministers had already taken place, for Pakington was able to state that "he believed the proposal would not be opposed by the Government." But clearly not enough, for Palmerston, after a hurried consultation with colleagues on that evening, was unable to hold out the prospect of an early day. (3) Pakington asked again on 13 August (4) for an opportunity to proceed, but with the end of the Session fast approaching and the House bogged down in the intricate details of the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Bill, he was again refused.

When on 11 February 1858 Pakington finally moved for a Commission "to inquire into the present state of

---

(1) Hansard, CXLVIII, 1198, 11 February 1858.
(2) Hansard, CXLVII, 811, 31 July 1857.
(3) Pakington had hoped for the Thursday or Friday of the following week.
(4) Hansard, CXLVII, 1567, 13 August 1857.

popular education in England, and whether the present system is, or is not, sufficient for its object; and to consider and report what changes, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people," (1) the same uncertainty regarding Government attitudes still prevailed. Cowper had not resisted Pakington's initiative, and had even instructed Lingen to supply Pakington with official statistics, but the matter was far from being a fait accompli. Indeed the motion involved the House both in a lengthy debate (2) and ultimately in a division.

Pakington's own speech (3) makes compelling reading. He began by proving once more that existing education was deficient both in quantity and quality. He also showed that there were good grounds for concluding that the situation was worsening rather than improving, and made telling comparison with educational provision in other countries. He urged that the House devoted too much time to party struggles and not enough to matters which "affect only the welfare and the interest of the people." (4) He drew attention to the interest in education in the country as a whole, to the conferences and congresses, including that of the N.A.P.S.S. at Birmingham. Legislation was needed immediately, but since the Government seemed unable to act, and independent bills such as his own had achieved no success, a Commission would be the next step forward. In spite of the expenditure on education from annual parliamentary grants, the army of inspectors, some forty-six in 1857, the complicated system of Minutes, there was, in Pakington's view, only half a system, which still lacked effective local organization. Moreover, many years had elapsed since the last extensive inquiry into

---

(1) Hansard, CXLVIII,1184-5, 11 February 1858.
(2) It occupied sixty-five columns of Hansard.
(3) Hansard, CXLVIII, 1184-98, 11 February 1858.
(4) Ibid., 1191.

educational provision. Pakington posed the issue of a Select Committee or a Royal Commission. He would, if appointed chairman of a Select Committee, (1) be able to direct the inquiry into relevant areas, and thus to influence the report. But he had sufficient confidence in the justice of his cause to propose a Royal Commission which could be conducted in a "more calm and dispassionate manner," and which would produce "a Report that will carry greater weight in the country." (2)

As an example of a successful Commission Pakington returned to his Poor Law analogy. "The Government of 1833 appointed seven of the most able and distinguished men, at the head of whom was the late lamented Bishop of London, (3) to carry out that inquiry. They sent Deputy Commissioners throughout the country to collect facts, they put those facts together and stated their own views, and the result was that in the following year the Government came down to this House and carried that great measure." (4) The only difference indeed, Pakington claimed, was that whilst the Commission of 1833 had been proposed by the then Government, "In the present case the Commission is proposed by a humble Member of this House, who has not even a party support to look to on this proposal." (5) Pakington concluded by reaffirming that his purpose in moving for a Commission was to arm the Government with the authority of facts and the support of public opinion so that it would "at last legislate on

---

(1) It was normal practice for the proposer of such a motion, if successful, to be nominated to the chairmanship of the Committee.
(2) Ibid., 1197.
(3) Bishop Charles James Blomfield (1786-1857). Blomfield had considerable influence in education, particularly over the appointment of H.M.I. John Allen in 1839. The Blomfield Letter Books (Fulham Papers), are deposited in the Lambeth Palace Library. See also C.E. Biber, Bishop Blomfield and his Times (1857), and A. Blomfield, A Memoir of C.J. Blomfield, Bishop of London (2 vols., 1863).
(4) Hansard, CXLVIII, 1197-8, 11 February 1858.
(5) Ibid., 1198.

this subject in such a manner as to effect that object which I have sincerely at heart, and which I hope I may live to see accomplished, solely because I believe it to be essential to the true character and welfare of the people." (1)

There were mixed reactions to Pakington's speech. Those in support included Stanley, who seconded the motion, and Russell who saw it as likely to secure "a very considerable object". (2) Fox, however, wisely warned that one should not presume too much in advance on the Commission's findings or recommendations, and Edward Akroyd, Liberal M.P. for Huddersfield, a factory owner and promoter of education both in his own works and in his local area, (3) drew attention to the need for specific inquiry into factory education. Hadfield, went further in proposing an amendment to add to the inquiry that it should be concerned with the fundamental issue of secular or religious education. (4) Opponents included Gathorne Hardy, Conservative M.P. for Leominster who argued that the situation was improving, that a Commission was therefore superfluous, and that before condemning the existing system the House should consider what could be put in its place.

Cowper, too, now hesitated. He was not opposed to an inquiry as such, and he had considerable respect for Pakington, but Cowper had "heard with some anxiety the allusion made by the right hon. Baronet to the Poor Laws," (5) and he disliked the particular wording of the motion inasmuch as it implied that the Commission itself, rather than Parliament, should determine policy. Pakington, it would appear, (and he secured the support of Russell on this point) had some reason to complain of Cowper's speech,

---

(1) Ibid.
(2) Ibid., 1238.
(3) He had attended the Birmingham meeting of the N.A.P.S.S. in 1857.
(4) Palmerston persuaded Hadfield to withdraw this amendment.
(5) Hansard, CXLVIII, 1231, 11 February 1858.

for "It had been held out to him, that Her Majesty's Government intended to support his Motion as it stood upon the paper." (1) Russell, indeed, urged Pakington that it would be better to withdraw the motion than to continue for the sake of a nominal success with a compromise which would effectively deprive the Commission of the power of genuine inquiry. Pakington was himself uncertain at this point, but eventually agreed to delete the words "whether the present system is, or is not, sufficient for its object." Cowper having accepted this amendment, and Hadfield's amendment having been withdrawn, only one more hurdle remained. Henley had naturally spoken (2) against Pakington's motion, and had urged the House to abide by the existing system. He now determined to divide the House, but Pakington carried the day with 110 votes to 49, a majority of 61. (3)

On 19 February 1858 another important vote took place. The Radicals had their revenge when Palmerston was defeated on the Conspiracy to Murder Bill by 234 votes to 215. (4) Bright (5) and Milner Gibson (6) acted as tellers on that occasion, and they numbered amongst their majority Cardwell, Cecil, Disraeli, Ewart, Fox, Gladstone, Graham, Herbert, Pakington, Roebuck, Russell, Stanley and Walpole. Derby formed his second government, and Pakington was placed as far as possible away from educational matters in the office of First Lord of the Admiralty.(7) There had

---

(1) Ibid., 1246.
(2) Ibid., 1232-7.
(3) Ibid., 1248. Unfortunately no list of the division is given in Hansard. The Royal approval was given on 15 February 1858.
(4) Hansard, CXLVIII, 1846, 19 February 1858.
(5) Bright had only recently re-entered Parliament, having been returned for Birmingham following the death of George Muntz.
(6) Though Milner Gibson found a place in Palmerston's Cabinet in July 1859 as President of the Board of Trade.
(7) Though he did have responsibility for naval schools and training establishments and was in consequence a member of the Committee of Privy Council. Russell had suggested to Grey that Pakington should be invited to serve on the Royal Commission. Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/18/6/56-8, Russell to Granville, 19 February 1858.

been some newspaper speculation as to whether Pakington's recent stance on education would disbar him from office, but Derby's party was not so over-endowed with men of talent that his services could be dispensed with. Pakington, for his part, graciously announced that "after the most serious reflection I arrived at the conclusion that there was nothing in the subject of national education to prevent me from giving my humble assistance to Her Majesty's Government." (1) Salisbury was appointed Lord President and Adderley (2) to the Vice-Presidency. There was no likelihood of Pakington's being considered for either of these posts. The Colonial Secretaryship, Pakington's former office, went to a reluctant Stanley, but only after Lytton and Manners had both refused.

Adderley, who had formerly opposed the idea of a Commission, now saw it as his duty to render its labours "efficient and useful" and he grudgingly conceded that it "might throw some light on this great subject." (3) Pakington's onerous duties at the Admiralty, (4) where he was both involved with major battles with Disraeli over expenditure and faced with the delicate (5) problem of appointing a Commission on the Manning of the Navy, did not prevent his taking an interest in the appointment of the Education Commission. He was in communication with Salisbury, whom he thought "sincerely desirous to appoint

---

(1) Pakington's speech to his constituents on the occasion of his re-election consequent upon his accepting the office of First Lord of the Admiralty. The Times, 4 March 1858.
(2) Adderley was not of the Cabinet, though he was also President of the Board of Health.
(3) Hansard, CLI, 138, 21 June 1858.
(4) See p.17.
(5) Delicate, because the Queen had strong views on the matter. She wanted men who were "uncompromised", and who would "approach it with unprejudiced minds". Derby counselled that whilst members of the Government should not be included it would be essential to ensure that the Commission was not composed of a majority of political opponents.

the Commission and to appoint it fairly," (1) but lacking the experience of education which would enable him to select the best persons. This led to delay, and Pakington who hoped for a report and legislation within a year, or two at the most, in May wrote urgently to Derby to "express my regret that the Education Commission is not yet appointed ... I am apprehensive of our good faith being doubted." (2)

Two significant points about the origins of the Newcastle Commission can conveniently be summarized at this point. Firstly Pakington was the true 'parent' (3) of the Commission, both in the long term sense inasmuch as it was a logical development of his work for national education throughout the preceding five years, and in the immediate sense in that it was his persistence alone which finally persuaded the Government and the Commons to follow this course. Pakington's own account of the proceedings on the evening of 11 February gives some indication of how uncertain the matter was.

"I recently made a motion for a Royal Commission to inquire into the state of education in England, and I was told, a few days before I made it, that the Government would decidedly oppose me. When I got to the House I was told that they would decidedly support me. In the course of the evening I was informed by a friend of mine that they had changed their minds three times, and at last the Minister, when he had heard everybody else speak, got up and said that he would neither support nor oppose me, but he hoped I would omit the latter half of my resolution, and he would accept the first. My answer was, "I have a great question in hand and an important public object to attain, and I will be no party to emasculating my resolution and making it worthless because you can't make

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 3835/11/(iii)/19a, Copy of Pakington to Derby, 25 May 1858.
(2) Ibid.
(3) He himself used this term on more than one occasion.

up your mind." And I added that rather than cut it in two I would abandon it altogether. In the middle of my motion, however, there were one or two words to which a meaning different from what I had intended was attached, and when I had consented to alter these, both the first and the last half of the resolution were agreed to." (1)

Secondly, it is important to consider Pakington's purpose in moving for a Commission. His primary aim was the achievement of an effective system of national education. The creation of the Education Department and the Vice-Presidency in 1856 had been but a first step, and Pakington had wished to see it followed by further acts. He hoped for a measure to provide good-quality schooling for all the children in the country, and having tried and failed to achieve such legislation himself, he now wanted to strengthen the hand of the Whig Government, or rather to force its hand, by bringing about the production of a report which could not be ignored. The model of the Poor Law Commission which he held up suggested the possibility of extensive yet swift report and legislation. An act could bring education under closer parliamentary control, and at the same time remove some of its superintendence from the shadowy areas of the Committee of Privy Council, 'My Lords', the administrators and the system of Minutes. Though overall a truly national system would require greater public finance, this would not necessarily result in an increase in the central government fund, indeed there could well be a diminution from this source, but might depend instead upon local finance, supervised and applied by popularly-elected local bodies. Detailed and impartial inquiry, Pakington believed, would reveal the inadequacy of school provision in terms of quantity and quality. His personal experience,

---

(1) Pakington's speech to his constituents, The Times, 4 March 1858.

the witness of the Church Education Society, of the Ragged School movement, the reports of H.M.I.'s, even the census of Mann, all pointed, in Pakington's judgement, to the inescapable conclusion that a system of education worthy of the nation, i.e. which comprised sufficient good schools accessible to all children, dependent upon reliable sources of income, staffed by trained and dedicated teachers, offering a broad curriculum and catering for pupils into their teenage years, could not be supplied under the existing system, and necessitated a major education act. Pakington had come to that conclusion well before 1858, the Royal Commission reached it in 1861, but Parliament, the two major political parties and the country as a whole were prevented from reaching it until 1870 by the decisions of the Liberal Cabinet in 1861 and 1862, decisions which substituted in place of an act, the Revised Code.

The major conclusion of the Report of the Newcastle Commission, as the following extract indicates, was essentially that which Pakington had anticipated.

"Our attention, however, has principally been devoted to the system of aid and inspection established by Your Majesty's Government, which has now for twenty years given a powerful stimulus to the building of schools, and has created a class of schoolmasters and pupil-teachers of a superior character to any previously known in this country. We have found it stimulating voluntary subscriptions, offering many excellent models of teaching, and adapting itself to the character of the people by leaving both the general management of the schools and their religious teaching free. On the other hand we have exposed great and growing defects in its tendency to indefinite expense, in its inability to assist the poorer districts, in the partial inadequacy of its teaching, and in the complicated business which encumbers the central office of the Committee of Council; and these defects have led us to believe that any attempt to extend

it unaltered into a national system would fail. We have therefore proposed, while retaining the leading principles of the present system and simplifying its working, to combine with it a supplementary and local system which may diffuse a wider interest in education, may distribute burdens more equally, and may enable every school in the country to participate in its benefits." (1)

Thus, as Pakington had foretold, the Commissioners found the existing system to be increasingly defective in a number of ways. They concluded, as had Pakington, that no mere extension of it could be considered to be an adequate basis for national education. Instead a supplementary local system of the type envisaged by Pakington, with local boards and local rating, was deemed by the Commissioners to be essential. Moreover, in company with Pakington, the Commissioners came to reject the idea of parochial rating, and plumped for a system of borough and county (2) education authorities. Thus the Report recommended "That in every county or division of a county having a separate county rate there shall be a County Board of Education," and "That in corporate towns, which at the census last preceding contained more than 40,000 inhabitants, the town council may appoint a Borough Board of Education ... ." (3) Finance would thus be supplied from the proceeds of the county or borough rate. Moreover the Commissioners, fortified by the encouraging evidence as to the numbers of children whose names were entered on the school rolls, followed Pakington's

---

(1) P.P. 1861, xxi, Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State of Popular Education in England, (hereafter the Newcastle Commission), I, 542.
(2) Pakington had not included county boards in the Bill of 1857, but had intended the provision for cities and corporate towns to be a first step only.
(3) Ibid., I, 545.

recommendation of 1857 that the first step should not be the erection of new schools, but rather the improvement of those already in existence. Thus the Report acknowledged; "It is quite possible to support a school already in existence by a rate in aid, and yet to leave its management and its religious teaching substantially free, and proposals to this effect were made ... in the Bill of Sir John Pakington." (1) This cautious attitude towards local agency, which sought to avoid both controversies over the issues of religion and management by suggesting initially rates in aid of existing schools, and the charge of indiscriminate expense by advocating the principle of payment by results, showed that the lessons of the legislative proposals of the 1850's in general, and of Pakington's conclusions in particular, had been well learned.

Pakington had justified his scheme for a national system based upon local intervention, by frequent reference to evidence which showed the deficiency of existing school provision in relation to both quality and quantity. The most important fact to be borne in mind in relation to the current controversy over educational provision in the mid-nineteenth century is that the Commissioners reached the same conclusions as Pakington in spite of the evidence collected as to the quantity of children in schools. (2)

That evidence, in brief, was that of an estimated population in mid-1858 for England and Wales of 19,523,103, the names of 2,535,462 children were on the books of week-day schools, a shortfall, of only 120,305 children. This constituted a proportion to the total population of 1 in

---

(1) Ibid., I, 302. The Commissioners here, however, were probably referring to the Bill of 1855 rather than that of 1857.
(2) Or, to be as precise as possible, the numbers of names returned as being on the school rolls.

7.7, or 12.99%, and though not as impressive a figure as that of Prussia, 1 in 6.27, where education was compulsory, significantly better than in Holland, 1 in 8.11, or France, 1 in 9.0. Nevertheless these figures gave the Commissioners little comfort. They observed that "... many of the schools are exceedingly bad, and the attendance is frequently so irregular as to be of little value." (1) In spite of the progress made since the return of 1818 which had shown a proportion of only 1 in 17.25, the Newcastle Commissioners concluded "that a very delusive estimate of the state of education must result from confining attention to the mere account of numbers under day-school instruction." (2) Delusive indeed, for of the 2,213,694 children of the poorer classes in schools in 1858, 573,536 attended private schools which the Commission found to be generally and uniformly inferior. Of the 1,549,312 children whose names were on the books of public elementary schools 786,202 attended for less than 100 days in the year, whilst the financial aid of the Committee of Council not only did not touch the 573,536 children of the private schools, but it also left unassisted 671,393 pupils in 15,750 denominational, and 317 Birkbeck, Ragged and Factory schools. The Report was at one with Pakington, therefore, on the poor quality and inappropriate nature of much of the education, and on the inability of the existing system substantially to improve that situation. The Commissioners sadly concluded that though the uninspected schools had been shown to be far worse than the inspected, "even with regard to the inspected, we have seen overwhelming evidence from Her Majesty's Inspectors, to the effect that not more than one-fourth

---

(1) Report of the Newcastle Commission, I, 86.
(2) Ibid., I, 294.

of the children receive a good education." (1)

Whilst the Report of the Newcastle Commission caused Pakington to moderate his views and statements on the quantity of school provision, it fully vindicated his concern about the quality of education. Even though it is impossible to deny that Pakington had in the 1850's been guilty of exaggeration, or sheer error, in his use of educational statistics, it is important to notice that he had a concept of education which went beyond a mere 5.7 year calculation, and which justified him, when moving for the Royal Commission, in drawing attention to a most significant, and to him disturbing, trend. Pakington had become alarmed by "the extremely early ages at which children leave school and the impossibility of continuing any satisfactory system of education after they have so left." (2) Inspectors' reports, for example that of H.M.I. Watkins on Yorkshire, noted "an overwhelming proportion of the children at school are under ten years of age, and,what is worse, that for some reason or other, this evil in increasing." (3) Pakington on 11 February 1858 thus armed himself on this matter, principally through the good offices of Cowper, with a paper furnished by Lingen which showed that whereas in 1850 some 37.2% of children in inspected schools were above

---

(1) Ibid., I, 295. The Commissioners however were probably over-pessimistic in their judgement. The subsequent controversy, which involved H.M.I. Norris and Reverend T.R. Birks, is usefully summarized in A. Tropp, The School Teachers (1957), 73. A more fundamental critique of the Commissioners' figures is to be found in Central Committee of Schoolmasters, Returns concerning the Assistant Commissioners of Education and Inspected Schools, in the Ten Specimen Districts (1862). See also F.P. Burns, 'Steps towards a national system of education in England 1833-1870, with special reference to the Report of the Newcastle Commission 1861', Oxford University B.Litt. thesis, 1965.

(2) Hansard, CXLVIII, 1189, 11 February 1858.

(3) Ibid.

ten years of age, by 1857 that proportion had fallen to 27.9%, with only 10.2% of pupils aged twelve or over.(1) Such facts were fully confirmed by the Commission's detailed inspection of specimen districts. These showed that 53.5% of scholars in private week-day schools were under seven years of age, whilst only 19.1% were over ten, even though scholars in the higher class of private week-day schools remained longer at school than those in the public day schools. Statistics of pupils in public day schools showed that less than 30% were aged ten or over, that 19.3% were aged eleven or upwards, and only 11.4% aged twelve or more.(2)

Pakington had also had placed in his hand on the morning of 11 February a paper by Keith Johnston which included a diagram showing the percentage of the population between the ages of seven and fourteen who were receiving school instruction in seventeen European countries. Saxony topped the list with almost 100%, followed in order by Holland, Prussia, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Belgium, Austria, Scotland, with England tenth with a mere 45%.(3) Pakington saw this table as another indictment of the state of English education, and H.M.I. Norris's account in the Report of some 5.7 years of schooling typically 'enjoyed' by a potter's child confirmed his assessment. "At eighteen months or two years old he is sent to one of the dames who gain a livelihood by taking care of young children

---

(1) Report of the Committee of Council on Education (1858-9),5. The Department concluded that more infant schools had been established in the 1850's, and that children were "now sent to school at an earlier age than that at which they were sent in former times."

(2) Report of the Newcastle Commission, I, 656.

(3) Though English children would appear to have started school at an earlier age than their continental counterparts. See R. Szreter, 'The Origins of Full-Time Compulsory Education at Five', British Journal of Educational Studies, XIII (1), 1964.

whose mothers are at the factory. There, from seven in the morning to eight or nine at night, he is stowed away in a small room, without exercise or change of air, predisposing the constitution to consumption, which is a common malady in the pottery towns. This continues, on an average for four years. He is then, at five and a half or six years old, sent perhaps to the National School, where he stays one or two, or at most three years; but during the latter part of the time he is sure to be kept away very much, to act as an occasional substitute for some other boy who is at work. At eight or nine (earlier if his parents are drunken or improvident, often at six or seven) he begins to work regularly for a journeyman potter ... ." (1)

The lengthy proceedings of the Newcastle Commission relieved Pakington of the necessity of introducing any further education bills into the Commons during the years 1858-61. His interest in education at a local level, however, naturally continued; for example in October 1858 he spoke at length at a meeting of the newly established Worcester Union of Educational Institutes, (2) a grouping of mechanics' and literary institutes which Pakington compared to the East Lancashire Union, whose first annual prizegiving he had graced a year earlier. He also attended N.A.P.S.S. meetings, and continued in the leadership of the movement to reverse the Ragged School Minute of 1857.

Within Parliament, in the debate on the second reading of the Representation of the People Bill, (3) on 28 March

---

(1) Quoted in J. Kay-Shuttleworth, Four Periods of Public Education (1862), 585.
(2) Reported in The Times, 8 October 1858.
(3) The Government was defeated on this issue by 330 votes to 291. An election was held in May, and after a further defeat by 323 votes to 310 on the Queen's Speech Derby tendered his resignation.

1859, Pakington made an important speech in which he linked the themes of education and the extension of the franchise. Pakington himself on that occasion was content to argue for an extension of the householder and lodger franchise, but he also declared "I very much wish we could see an educational franchise adopted." (1)

More important, however, was Pakington's determination to hold a watching brief over the Commission's work. Thus on 22 July 1859 he used the occasion of the Supply debate to ask Lowe whether Newcastle's appointment to the Colonial Secretaryship meant that he was no longer presiding over the Royal Commission, and that, if that were the case, would a new chairman soon be appointed? But his second and more urgent question was "what prospect was there of the House receiving the Report of that Commission?" (2) Pakington no doubt sensed, as 1859 and 1860 came and went without the production of a Report, that the existence of the Commission, in the short term, was a handicap to the national education cause. He therefore continued to press for the early presentation to Parliament of the Report, (3) though its appearance was irritatingly further delayed by the inclusion of appendices and statistical returns.

Finally in 1861, when the Report of the Commission had been presented to Parliament, and Granville (4) in the

---

(1) Hansard, CLIII, 1002, 28 March 1859. Pakington had earlier discussed the matter with Joseph Sturge, but had been unwilling to accept Sturge's simple test of literacy, namely, "that a man should write his name." Sturge was, with Cobden, a visitor to Westwood. W.S.R.O. Cobden Mss. 107, Pakington to Mrs Cobden, 23 June 1867.

(2) Hansard, CLV, 335, 22 July 1859.

(3) As, for example, on 21 February 1860 when he asked Lowe point blank when the Report would be presented to Parliament. Hansard, CLVI, 1472, 21 February 1860.

(4) Lord President of the Council, in response to a question from Lyttelton. Hansard, CLXIV, 484-90, 8 July 1861.

Lords had indicated that the Government, far from introducing a bill to implement the Commissioners' recommendation of establishing County and Borough Education Boards, was proposing merely a Minute relating to the simplification of the business of the Council Office and the appointment of teachers, Pakington made an impassioned plea to the Liberal Government not to shirk its responsibility. In May Pakington had taken the opportunity of a discussion initiated by Northcote's motion for a Select Committee on the Education of Neglected and Destitute Children to praise the Commissioners "for issuing a most important compendium on the great subject of national education," and to remind Russell of the support he had given in securing the Commission's appointment. He then cordially invited Russell to "find leisure to look into the book," and not to allow the Report "to remain long without leading to practical results." (1) Now on 11 July 1861, however, three days after Granville's announcement in the Lords, aware that his whole long-term strategy for securing an act to establish local education boards was about to be lost by default, Pakington used the occasion of a Commons order for Committee of Supply for an heroic attempt to convince Palmerston and his Government that they were now perfectly poised finally to establish by legislation a worthy basis for national education.

Pakington's speech (2) had five main purposes; to place the Report of the Commission in the context of the legislative attempts of the 1850's, to appeal personally to Russell and Newcastle to exert their influence in the Cabinet to secure a bill, to show the impartial nature of

---

(1) Hansard, CLXIII, 213, 28 May 1861. Russell was Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and much exercised in 1861-2 by issues arising from the Civil War in the U.S.A.
(2) Hansard, CLXIV, 699-709, 11 July 1861.

the Commission and its workings, to draw attention to the findings of the Report, and to secure from the Government a promise of legislation early in the next session. In describing the origins of the Commission and its conclusions, Pakington emphasized the identification of his own and Russell's aims. Thus he stressed the links between his own Bills of 1855 and 1857 and Russell's resolutions of 1856. He implied that Russell and he had stood shoulder to shoulder in their determination to achieve either legislation or "inquiry with a view to legislation," (1) and advised the House that Russell's views "were in entire harmony with those of the Commissioners." (2) He also referred to Newcastle and to his chairmanship of the Commission in very flattering terms.

The impartiality of the Commission was another of Pakington's themes. His motion in 1858 had been approved during Palmerston's ministry, but the Commission had been appointed under Derby's premiership. Salisbury in nominating its members, Pakington now stated, had consulted neither Henley nor himself, but had chosen impartial and moderate men, whilst the Commission's proceedings and its voluminous Report were both characterized by a "calm and dispassionate temper". (3) The Report itself, Pakington justly concluded, fully upheld the five conclusions which Russell and he had earlier drawn as to the fundamental deficiencies of the existing elementary school system. These were that large numbers of the population were in a deplorable state of ignorance, that large districts of the country were supplied with very inefficient schools or no schools at all, (4) that children left school at too early an age,

---

(1) Ibid., 701.
(2) Ibid., 708.
(3) Ibid., 702.
(4) Pakington henceforth wisely modified his earlier statements about deficiencies in the numbers of schools.

that local agency was indispensable, and that the existing system could not be extended in its present form to meet the requirements of the whole country. Having summarized the main conclusions of the Report Pakington addressed himself again to the Liberal front bench. With both Russell and Newcastle in the Cabinet, Pakington thought "... it was not unreasonable to ask the Government to tell the House whether they would seriously consider the contents of the Report with a view to legislation at no distant date. The circumstances of the present moment were particularly favourable ... and made him sanguine that the Government would approach the consideration of the Report with an earnest desire to found upon it some measure which might supply those deficiencies in the present system which could hardly be disputed or denied ... He hoped, therefore, that he should receive from the Government an assurance that they were aware of the deep importance of the Report ... and that at no distant day - he hoped in the next Session of Parliament - they would be ready to propose such legislation as after mature deliberation they might think the case required." (1)

That assurance was not forthcoming. There was no bill, but in its stead, the Revised Code.

In the years 1858-61 there was considerable parliamentary concern about expenditure on education. Economy was in the air. The nation had been involved in expensive wars and even in peacetime was from 1858 being required to sanction a considerable increase in expenditure upon the navy. (2) This concern, which was

---

(1) Ibid., 708-9.
(2) Principally by Pakington, who as First Lord presided over the birth of Britain's ironclad navy.

shared on both sides of the House, was expressed fundamentally in two ways, both by attempts to prevent any increase in parliamentary grants to education and by demands for tighter control and cost-effectiveness. On the Liberal side Gladstone was a major critic. In 1856 he had opposed the creation of the Vice-Presidency on grounds of expense, in 1857 had castigated many departments, including Education, for their "spirit of extravagance", whilst in 1860, on the second reading of an Education Bill [1] whose principal object was to ensure that children under twelve should not be continuously employed unless either able to read and write or provided with part-time education, he deplored "the threatening circumstances arising from the heavy expenditure for education that had been going on for some years," and declared "the passing of the Bill at the present moment was as much out of the question as a Bill to abolish the House of Commons." [2] Gladstone's views on this subject were well-known and frequently expressed, and Pakington was particularly concerned at their effect. He himself noted in 1860 that "successive Chancellors of the Exchequer had complained of the magnitude of these grants," [3] and expressed his suspicions two years later "that the Revised Code is intended not only to promote the welfare of the working classes, but to ease the mind and facilitate the task of the Chancellor of the Exchequer." [4]

Robert Lowe, Vice-President of the Council from 1859 and Chancellor of the Exchequer in Gladstone's first ministry, however, was himself fully convinced of the need to curb educational expenditure. Though he had been chairman of a Select Committee on Education in

---

(1) Moved by Adderley.
(2) Hansard, CLIX, 2025, 17 July 1860.
(3) Hansard, CLX, 1302, 14 August 1860.
(4) Hansard, CLXVI, 207, 27 March 1862.

New South Wales, he had no constant and genuine interest in the education of the poor as such, and indeed in 1863 wrote to Sir Alfred Stephen that, "It is curious that I never took any lively interest in the question of popular education; and yet that both here and in Australia it has been forced upon me by circumstances which I could not control." (1) Lowe had calculated that with the cost of annual government grants at something less than £1 per head, if three million children were so supported, 18,000 schoolteachers, 45,000 pupil teachers, 200 inspectors and some £2,500,000 p.a. would be required. Lowe did not contemplate such a prospect with equanimity. He hoped that any changes in the education system would "not be attended by unreasonable expenditure or the imposition of additional burdens upon the revenue of the country." (2)

But it was the estimate of another Chancellor of the Exchequer of the probable cost of national education which received the most considerable publicity, for, on 19 April 1858, shortly after the Conservative Government had taken office, Disraeli made the following statement.

"When I saw the amount which this year would be incurred under the head of Education - when I remembered that regularly, every year, there had been a large augmentation in the votes for that object - I felt it my duty to form some opinion of this growing branch of our outgoings, and of what means we have of controlling this expenditure, or of ascertaining generally the relation in which that department was placed to the Exchequer of this country. Now, Sir, after having examined the subject - and giving no opinion, I beg the Committee to observe, upon the policy or impolicy of this establishment, but only anxious that hon. Gentlemen should

---

(1) Quoted in R. Knight, Illiberal Liberal, Robert Lowe in New South Wales, 1842-1850 (1966), 84.
(2) Hansard, CLV, 321-2, 22 July 1859.

clearly understand the responsible position they occupy in reference to this matter - it is my deliberate conviction that a system is now rapidly developing in this department of our expenditure, which in a very few years, will arrive at an amount of at least £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 sterling." (1)

Disraeli's financial reputation notwithstanding, this estimate was widely reported and frequently quoted. (2) Though Adderley suggested that with one million educated in private schools governments grants for the other two millions might be £1,400,000 p.a., reducing to as low as £1,000,000 p.a. once all the schools had been built, there was a general parliamentary determination to exercise greater vigilance over the grant. Pakington shared that determination. Indeed he supported Disraeli's estimate that, if the existing system were persevered in, the vote would reach £2½ - £3m. p.a. Pakington "did not believe in the possibility of a central board administering such an amount with due economy and with proper advantage to the public. Nevertheless, he was not disposed to vote against a single shilling of the amount till he saw some better system proposed." (3) Pakington envisaged supplementary local rating as the obviously better system, but Lowe regarded this solution as totally unnecessary and ineffective, a further complication, indeed, which would only increase public expenditure overall.

This was not the only issue of principle upon which Pakington and Lowe clashed during the years 1858-61. For Pakington argued that one way to improve the efficiency of the grant system would be to give money where it was most needed, rather than in aid of wealthy districts who

---

(1) Hansard, CXLIX, 1272, 19 April 1858.
(2) For example in The Times, 21 April 1858, and in the Commons by Gilpin on 21 June 1858, and by Hadfield on 14 August 1860.
(3) Hansard, CLV, 335, 22 July 1859.

could already help themselves. (1) Pakington therefore continued as champion of the Ragged School movement's campaign to secure a greater share in the parliamentary grant. Thus on 14 August 1860 he moved that Ragged and Industrial Schools as being alone adapted to meet the wants of a considerable number of destitute and neglected children, "are therefore entitled to a larger amount in aid than they at present receive." (2) Pakington, in his lengthy speech on that occasion, admitted that the Minute of 1856 had been overgenerous, but advised that in 1857 the Government had gone to the other extreme. Policy since that time had been influenced by a paper issued in 1860 and bearing the signatures of both Granville and Lowe, which advised that grants to Ragged Schools could not be increased "without confounding public instruction with public maintenance, and breaking down the self-respect of the poor, as well as lowering the standard of many of the schools which the poor now frequent." (3) Pakington, whose motion was seconded by a Liberal, Adam Black, was firmly opposed by Lowe who reaffirmed "The practice of the Committee of Council was not to give grants in consideration of the requirements and necessities of schools, but in consideration of private persons coming forward and supporting them." (4) Pakington became quite incensed by Lowe's line of argument and was moved to cry out, "Can you not trust your inspectors?". "Certainly not", (5) was Lowe's reply. Pakington's proposal, in a

---

(1) For example Herby, Pakington's second son, received a prize under the Science and Art Department scheme. Pakington felt that such government money could be put to better use.
(2) Hansard, CLX, 1268, 14 August 1860.
(3) Ibid., 1274.
(4) Ibid., 1291.
(5) Ibid., 1293. The full significance of that difference of principle was shown in 1864 by Lowe's resignation over the very issue of mutilation, or supposed mutilation, of inspectors' reports. Lowe's distrust of his inspectors came to be matched by the inspectors' and the Commons' distrust of Lowe.

House depleted by "grouse shooting, yacht sailing, Swiss touring, and other well-known attractions," [1] was defeated by 41 votes to 25. Pakington continued in the leadership of this cause into 1861, and on 23 January of that year presided at a great conference held at Dee's Royal Hotel, Birmingham. The movement now numbered amongst its supporters several M.P.'s including Black, Blencoe, Buchanan, Lockhart, Lyons, Maguire, Miles, Milnes, Northcote, Raynham, Scholefield, Verney and Winnington, whilst powerful advocates in the Lords included Shaftesbury, Brougham and Lyttelton. [2] On 28 May when Northcote successfully moved for a Select Committee to inquire into the Education of Destitute Children, both Pakington and Lowe were nominated members of it. [3] Lowe on that occasion reiterated his opposition to making grants to Ragged Schools on the same scale as to other schools. He abhorred the principle that "grants to these schools should be made rather in proportion to the necessity of the case than to the degree of progress, cleanliness and good instruction which is secured in them." [4]

---

(1) Pakington's speech at the Birmingham conference, 23 January 1861. This forms part (pp. 3-10) of the Authorized Report of the Conference held in Birmingham, January 23rd, 1861. Ragged Schools in Relation to the Government Grants for Education (1861).

(2) George William, fourth Baron Lyttelton (1817-1876). Chairman of the governors of Saltley College, Principal of Queen's College, Birmingham, and first President of the Birmingham and Midland Institute. He was also, like Pakington, interested in colonial and church matters, and was Chairman of the Canterbury Association and of the Worcester Cathedral Restoration Committee. Member both of the Clarendon and Taunton Commissions, Lyttelton was in 1869 appointed Chief Commissioner of Endowed Schools. In this connection see P. Stansky, 'Lyttelton and Thring: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Education', Victorian Studies, V (3), 1962.

(3) Journal of the House of Commons (1861-2), CXVI, 243. P.P. 1861, vii, 395, Report from the Select Committee on the Education of Destitute Children.

(4) Hansard, CLXIII, 208, 28 May 1861.

Just as Pakington sought to anticipate the findings of the Commission in the years 1859-61 and to secure changes prior to the production of the Report, so too did Lowe, and with more success. Lowe's determination and ability were soon revealed. He was a leader. When in 1864 he was offered a seat on the Taunton Commission he declined, "I never like entering a body of the kind without having some hope of managing it, and here I see none." (1) He was, moreover, not without experience in dealing with reports on education. In New South Wales, as chairman of a Select Committee on Education, he admitted to examining witnesses "not so much to ascertain what system might best be introduced, but what terms they were willing to accede to." (2) He had, therefore, no compunction about introducing changes prior to the appearance of the Report, and indeed, in 1859, when moving his first set of Education estimates, Lowe informed the House of major deficiencies in the existing system which contributed to extra expenditure. These were principally the multiplication of inspectors necessitated by the denominational system, (3) the exclusiveness of which Lowe generally deplored, and the great complexity in paying the grant. In the following year Lowe presented his remedies. "A great reduction had been made in the building grant which had been diminished by three-eighths," (4) there would be no capitation grants for Scotland in the coming year, no further grants towards the erection of training schools, whilst the sum for pupil teachers would be reduced. Pakington himself saw Gladstone as the prime mover in these developments. He later

---

(1) Quoted in E. Fitzmaurice, Life of Granville (1905), I, 433.
(2) Quoted in R. Knight, Illiberal Liberal, Robert Lowe in New South Wales, 1842-1850 (1966), 88.
(3) Lowe estimated that one third of the inspectors were unnecessary.
(4) Hansard, CLX, 1298, 14 August 1860.

declared, "This reduction was not accidental; it arose out of the systematic determination of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to reduce the amount even for educational purposes. Of this they had several proofs." (1)

In 1861 Lowe, in introducing the Education estimates, advised that they had been prepared in advance of the publication of the Report of the Newcastle Commission, and were not related to it in any way. He then proceeded to give his own assessment of the Report and to declare the Government's intentions. He stated firstly "that the Commissioners have found very grievous faults with us and have left us with a set of recommendations which do not enable us to remedy those faults." (2) He rejected out of hand the solution of county and borough boards, and concentrated instead upon the evils of superficial and overambitious teaching and the limitations and complications of the system of government grants. Thus, in answer on that evening of 11 July 1861 to Pakington's plea for a promise of Government legislation to introduce a worthy system of national education, Lowe announced that a Minute would be placed on the table which would simplify grant distribution by making all payments direct to the school managers, and would require more stringent conditions of attendance and performance for qualification for capitation grant. Thus was the Revised Code born, and Pakington's plans received their severest setback.

July 1861 was therefore a crucial month in the history of English education. It has not generally been so recognized. For example D.W. Sylvester in his recent study Robert Lowe and Education (1974) writes of the late 1850's that "the idea of local rates for education was repeatedly shown to be a non-starter at this time," (3) and implies

---

(1) Hansard, CLXIV, 706, 11 July 1861.
(2) Ibid., 729, Adderley, for the Conservatives gave Lowe considerable support. He, too, considered the Commissioners' recommendations "wholly impracticable".
(3) D.W. Sylvester, Robert Lowe and Education (1974), 43.

that some such system as that introduced by the Revised Code was virtually inevitable; "In this sense Lowe was merely the agent for his times." (1) Pakington believed otherwise. The conclusion he had drawn from the failure of the bills of the 1850's was not that local rates for education as such was a non-starter, but that whilst private bills for such a purpose would fail, a government measure, which meant in practice a Whig-Liberal measure, particularly if supported by the Report of a Royal Commission, might succeed. In 1870 he was proved correct, and just as Pakington foretold such a bill was justified by its sponsor in the House of Commons in the light of the findings of a recent inquiry into education. (2) Even more significantly Gladstone and Lowe, who opposed the principle of a bill to establish local education boards in 1861-2 were two of its foremost advocates in the Cabinets of 1869-70.

The Revised Code was a defeat for Pakington, a defeat for his carefully laid plans for an education act, a defeat for local agency and increased public expenditure, a defeat for a genuine basis for national education. It was a victory, on the other hand, for Gladstone and Lowe, for economy, for small-mindedness, for the existing system, for the central Department and its system of Minutes. But it was only a temporary defeat and a hollow victory. The Revised Code in its conception and in its application brought condemnation from contemporaries and subsequent commentators alike. The Vice-President was hounded from office in April 1864, and a year later admitted to Pakington's Select Committee "my idea is that education would certainly be better conducted by rates levied by

---

(1) Ibid., 58.
(2) P.P. 1870, liv, 265, Return, confined to the Municipal Boroughs of Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester, of all Schools for the Poorer Classes of Children ... .

local bodies, with some central inspection," (1) though he still maintained that it was impossible so to do. By 1867 even Lowe was fully convinced. "We cannot suffer any large number of our citizens, now that they have obtained the right of influencing the destinies of the country, to remain uneducated. It was a great evil that we did so before - it was an evil and a reproach, a moral stigma upon us. But now it is a question of self-preservation - it is a question of existence ... ." (2) For Lowe, once that existence - of the Constitution, of the political and social order - was immediately endangered, education of the poor was essential. Pakington had for some twenty years prior to 1867 deemed education to be essential, for the true existence of the poor themselves.

Lowe's change of heart, the subsequent adoption of the national education cause by Gladstone and his Cabinet in 1869, the successes of the Acts of 1870 and 1902, show that there was nothing intrinsically wrong in Pakington's formula of private pressure, investigation, report, and government legislation to achieve a basis for national education by the statutory establishment of local education agencies. Two questions must therefore be considered at this point, why did Palmerston's government reject the recommendation in the Report of the Newcastle Commission of county and borough education boards, and was such a rejection inevitable in 1861-2? The principal answer to the first question would seem to be that those members of the Cabinet who from their concern for education might have been expected to support a proposal for local education agencies succumbed to the arguments and to the greater resolve of the exponents of strict economy. On the second issue, although a new Minute, or Code, rather than a bill

---

(1) Quoted in D.W. Sylvester, Robert Lowe and Education (1974), 118.
(2) R. Lowe, Primary and Classical Education (1867), 9.

was basic Department policy from 1860, there were significant moments when that resolve faltered, and had the Revised Code been abandoned, Pakington's policy might well have come to be seen as the natural alternative.

Newcastle informed Granville early in 1860 of the possible recommendations of the Commission, and urged the Cabinet "to commence a general system of reduction of expenditure," (1) though he later modified that advice to "check extension rather than to promote reduction." At the same time, however, Newcastle was clearly anxious about some of the Department's proposals and warned that "if you deal with the scheme of Pupil Teachers incautiously you may break down the whole fabric." Fitzmaurice states that, despite Gladstone's opposition, following the Report of the Commission, "the section of the Cabinet represented by Lord Granville and Lord John Russell desired three things - to make the Privy Council grants depend on the examination of individual scholars; to introduce a 'conscience clause'; and to encourage the foundation of schools, where the voluntary system was inadequate, supported by rates to be levied by municipal and county education authorities." (2) But ratepayer, including Nonconformist, opposition, Fitzmaurice argues, induced Granville not only to abandon the third of these objectives, but also, acting under Lowe's influence, to part company from Russell over the principle upon which government grants were to be distributed. Russell, though not totally committed to full implementation of the recommendations of the Report, in a memorandum of 4 January 1862 drew attention to the great defect that Privy Council grants were not forthcoming where voluntary subscriptions failed, and that

---

(1) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/18/12/5-6, Newcastle to Granville, 11 January 1860. The two short quotations which follow are also from this source.
(2) E. Fitzmaurice, Life of Granville (1905), I, 422.

in place of a broad scheme for extending education on something like a national basis, "All that remains, therefore, is an attempt to limit the extent, and degrade the quality of popular education." (1) Granville, in an attempt to argue that the Code was in accordance with the findings of the Report, thus unfairly summarized the Commissioners' views; "that if the aided schools benefited all the scholars as much as they benefit part of them, no ground of complaint would remain." (2) Palmerston, who had on occasion shown a genuine interest in the education of the poor, (3) was neither overawed by the size of government educational expenditure, nor a supporter of the Revised Code. His memorandum of January 1862 declared that "the money is well spent, and we have had its full value in the improved intelligence and good conduct of those classes ... the Bugbear held out, that the yearly expense will soon exceed two millions is undeserving of serious refutation ... There is not the slightest chance of maintaining the Revised Code. Every human being who has anything to do with schools is vehemently against it ... the prudent course will be to yield to the storm." (4)

---

(1) Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/130-2, 4 January 1862. Russell had refused to serve under Granville when the latter had attempted to form a government in 1859.

(2) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/19/4/30-3, undated memorandum.

(3) For example he was present at H.M.I. John Allen's inspection of schools in his parish. N. Ball, Her Majesty's Inspectorate, 1839-1849 (1963), 210.

(4) Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/128-9, January 1862. Indeed the Revised Code was not introduced into Scotland in 1862, and a Bill for the "extension of the old national education of Scotland" was introduced by Moncrieff, the Lord Advocate, on behalf of the Government on 19 March 1862. Hansard, CLXV, 1831, 19 March 1862. The Bill was later withdrawn. See also P.R.O. Ed. 9/4/82, Secretary's Minute Book, 25 February 1862.

But in January 1862 Granville and Lowe stood firm. Granville urged on the Cabinet his belief that there would be no Conservative party opposition as such, and that Adderley and Stanley were in favour of the Code, [1] whilst Lowe advised that unless the Government were prepared for an Education estimate which would ultimately exceed £2 million p.a. "it has no time to lose in making a stand." [2] Lowe declared impracticable the idea of grants from County boards, and reported that "We despaired of carrying a Bill charging the County rate." Sir George Grey, [3] Lord Stanley of Alderley, [4] Sir George Cornewall Lewis, [5] Sir Charles Wood, [6] and the Duke of Argyll, [7] all gave adherence, to a greater or lesser degree, to the basic principles of the Revised Code. Granville and Lowe also had their supporters outside the Cabinet and J.T. Delane wrote to hail their victories" over bigotry and prejudice". [8] But of greater proportions was the clamour of opposition. H.M.I. Bellairs reported in September 1861 [9] that his district was completely

---

(1) Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/136-7, printed memorandum by Granville on the Revised Code for the use of the Cabinet.
(2) Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/138-40, printed memorandum by Lowe on the Revised Code for the use of the Cabinet.
(3) Home Secretary, Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/141-2.
(4) Postmaster General, Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/143, 10 January 1862.
(5) Secretary of State for War, Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/145-6.
(6) Secretary of State for India, Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/147-8.
(7) Lord Privy Seal, Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/149. Unfortunately amongst this collection of opinions of individual Cabinet members there is no record of Gladstone's views. In April 1862 Palmerston was, however, still trying to convince Gladstone that money on education was well spent and that "we have derived great advantage from the outlay." Palmerston to Gladstone, 29 April 1862, quoted in P. Guedalla, The Palmerston Papers. Gladstone and Palmerston (1928), 206.
(8) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/19/4/36-7, Delane to Granville, 14 February 1862. The Times naturally declared itself for the Code. The Daily Telegraph, 14 February 1862, gave qualified support, but there was much hostile comment as in The Standard, 14 and 20 February 1862, which included a strong personal attack on Lowe on the latter date.
(9) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/19/4/24-5, Bellairs to Granville, 26 September 1861.

paralyzed, that teachers were being converted into political agitators and that education would be put back several years. Memorials, deputations, petitions and pamphlets poured in to Parliament and to the Council Office, [1] and Pakington was faced with the dilemma of how best to organize this agitation to further his own educational plans.

In October 1861 Pakington, therefore, wrote to Derby, inviting him to Westwood and urging him to agree on some policy of action before Parliament assembled. Pakington concluded that "we must concede at least one merit to the New Code. It has produced a degree of unanimity on the subject of Education which I never hoped to see." [2] Pakington carefully refrained, however, from outright criticism of the Liberal Government and its education

---

(1) P.P. 1862, xli, is a collection of over 300 memorials, pamphlets and letters presented against the Code. Ibid., 243-4 is the memorial of the Committee of the Worcester Diocesan Training College, and 467 that of members of the South Staffordshire and North Worcestershire Church of England Schoolmasters' Association. See also Volume VIII of the Education Miscellany collection of the D.E.S. Library which includes pamphlets by Birks, Bromby, Coleridge, Collins, Fitch, Grote, Kay-Shuttleworth and Vaughan. Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/27/134-5, is the important memorial of the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society. Kay-Shuttleworth's two Letters to Earl Granville K.G. (1861) were later incorporated into Four Periods of Public Education (1862). Pakington wrote to congratulate Kay-Shuttleworth on the success of the second pamphlet which sold over ten thousand copies. Though there are several references to meetings and correspondence between the two men no major correspondence appears to have survived in the Hampton or Kay-Shuttleworth Mss.

(2) Derby Mss. Box 141/10a, Pakington to Derby, 13 October 1861. It is unlikely that Derby came, for he was much troubled by gout, but Walpole did stay at Westwood in the autumn of 1861.

policy during the recess, for he still hoped for a statement of the Government's intentions towards the implementation of the Report of the Commissioners when Parliament reassembled. But on 13 February 1862 Granville in the Lords and Lowe in the Commons offered no more than a revision of the Code, and Pakington's hopes of a Liberal initiative were finally dashed by Lowe's announcement that this was "not a question of first rate magnitude ... and it really will be found to turn on the point simply of annual grants." (1)

At a Conservative 'Cabinet' on 14 February, however, it was resolved not to offer opposition to the basic principle of the new Code itself, but rather to seek concessions on points of detail. Interestingly enough Stanley, who appears to have become detached from Pakington at this time, conveyed this information to Lowe that same day, (2) whilst on Saturday, 15 February Derby wrote to Granville, (3) informing him that he would ask for the Code to be embodied in a series of resolutions which Parliament could consider as if they were clauses of a bill. Both Palmerston (4) and Lowe (5) advised Granville against agreeing to this request. Lowe indeed spent a sleepless night (6) on hearing of Derby's proposal, for he

---

(1) Hansard, CLXV, 197, 13 February 1862. Pakington naturally informed Lowe that on the contrary education was "a matter of grave importance". Ibid., 253-6.
(2) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/18/12/13-14, Lowe to Granville, 14 February 1862.
(3) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/18/12/17-18, Derby to Granville, 15 February 1862.
(4) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/19/4/40-1, Palmerston to Granville, 16 February 1862.
(5) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/18/12/15-16, Lowe to Granville, 16 February 1862.
(6) Ibid.

saw not only the threat to the Revised Code itself, but also to the freedom of action which the Education Department enjoyed. That cherished independence was eventually curtailed in 1870, and in September of that year a memorandum was circulated within the Department advising that the new Act would have to be construed by the courts, "and that this Department has no authority to put any particular construction upon its provisions, except so far as the Act gives them special authority to do so." (1)

On 17 February Granville accordingly declined to move resolutions, and on the next day Pakington wrote to Derby urging the Conservatives to take up the method of resolutions themselves. (2) On 20 February Walpole gave notice of his intention to move an Education resolution on 11 March, (3) whilst on 7 March the Liberal, Lyttelton moved, and then withdrew, in the Lords seven resolutions in detailed criticism of the Code. Granville had an unhappy time in the Lords that Spring, as on 4 March when fully exposed by Newcastle's absence and his own poor state of health he was assailed in a brilliant speech by 'Soapy Sam' Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, who deplored mechanical teaching, and argued that two million pounds of Government money devoted annually to national education would be money well spent. Pakington was naturally to the fore in such discoussions in the Commons, and made a major speech on 27 March in which he further appealed to

---

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 9/4/301, Secretary's Minute Book, September 1870.

(2) Derby Mss. Box 141/10a, Pakington to Derby, 18 February 1862. Pakington was unable to attend Derby's hastily summoned second 'Cabinet' on the following day, and he thus wrote at some length to outline his views. He suggested a single protest resolution concentrating upon the issue of annual school grants and pupil teachers, and referred to a further long conference which he had had with Kay-Shuttleworth since the meeting on the 14th.

(3) He eventually moved eleven resolutions on 25 March.

Newcastle to disavow "the introduction of a system which really and practically ignores and repudiates the laborious results of that Commission of which he was the Chairman." (1) Finally, on 5 May, after further debates and further revisions, Walpole gave the Conservatives' grudging acceptance of the Government's proposals. Pakington, in acknowledging defeat, however, called attention again to the Report of the Commission, and regretted once more, "that advantage has not been taken of the present opportunity to come to a final settlement of the question." (2)

Conservative 'Cabinet' policy in 1862, therefore, was to exploit the Government's discomfiture over the Revised Code, and to secure amendments and concessions where possible, but not to secure the total defeat of either the Code or the Government. Indeed there was considerable collusion between individual Conservative leaders and Granville and Lowe at this time,(3) whilst on the other hand Russell, on 12 May 1862, in his speech to the annual meeting of the British and Foreign School Society, went out of his way to pay a special tribute to "... Sir John Pakington, than whom no man has taken a greater interest or shown a more enlightened zeal upon the subject of education." (4) Pakington, however, regretted the concentration of discussion upon mere details of grants and expenditure. Accordingly he appealed to Palmerston to allow more time for reflection, and to place the Code in the wider context of other recommendations, particularly those of local agency and finance, raised by the Report.

---

(1) Hansard, CLXVI, 214, 27 March 1862.
(2) Hansard, CLXVI, 1230, 5 May 1862.
(3) For example Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/19/4/44-5, Leveson Gower to Granville, 28 March 1862, recounting a conversation with Walpole about the latter's resolutions, and Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/19/4/46-7, Northcote to Lowe, 21 April 1862.
(4) Educational Record, July 1862, 180.

He also appealed to Derby and Disraeli to consider resolutions of a more fundamental nature. But though Pakington entered into consultations with Kay-Shuttleworth, one of the leading opponents of the Revised Code, who declared his resolutions the "most prudent" for local agency he had yet seen, and even "shaped one or two in deference to his suggestions," (1) he could secure no general support within his own party. Kay-Shuttleworth, indeed, in his first Letter to Earl Granville, had declared himself to be against the Commissioners' recommendation of County Boards, for he judged that "The tendency of the local rating would be, not to stimulate, but to benumb voluntary exertion." (2) Walpole gave some encouragement to Pakington's scheme, but he had successfully outflanked him with his own resolutions and negotiations.

Pakington sent copies of his seven resolutions to Derby and Disraeli in April 1862. It represented a desperate attempt to salvage something from the ruins of his own policy, to provoke some further statement of policy from Lowe, and to secure a greater measure of financial support for schools in poorer districts. Though desperate in purpose, the resolutions themselves were innocuous and inchoate in the extreme.

1. "That the fact disclosed in the Report of the Education Commission, that there are Extensive Districts in which, from small population of parishes, and other causes, no benefit is derived from the annual grants by Parliament for the promotion of Education, ought to receive the immediate and careful attention of the Education Department.

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/67, Pakington to Disraeli, 10 April 1862.
(2) J. Kay-Shuttleworth, Four Periods of Public Education (1862), 571.

2. That, as the inhabitants of such districts contribute their fair share to the Public Revenue, they are therefore entitled, as much as their fellow countrymen in more fortunate localities, to share in the advantages to be derived from grants from the National Funds, appropriated by Parliament to the promotion of a National object.

3. That one main cause of the unequal distribution of the Annual Grant for Education is the absence of any organized local agency to assist and guide the Central Department.

4. That the difficulty of forming in small parishes a school committee such as exists in those which are more populous, renders it desirable that District Boards (or the present Diocesan Boards) should encourage and regulate local subscriptions - assist in the distribution of the Central grant - and promote the union of small parishes for the foundation and support of a common school.

5. That such District Boards, whether the present Diocesan Boards or otherwise, should in all matters connected with the expenditure of the Parliamentary grant, or with the inspection of schools with a view to assistance from that grant, act in connection with, and subject to the authority of the Central Education Department.

6. That special minutes should be framed to define the constitution and powers of such District Boards, and the mode of co-operation between them and the Central Department.

7. That the recommendations of the Education Commission with respect to those Education endowments and charities which are "noxious and useless as at present applied," constitute an important element in the question how best to extend popular Education, and require the careful consideration of H.M. Government."(1)

The resolutions were not adopted by the Conservative party, and Pakington who had framed them to "steer clear of the old disputed points," now saw little purpose in

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/67a, enclosed with B/XX/P/67.

pressing on with them alone.

Pakington's purpose in securing the appointment of the Royal Commission was soon forgotten by contemporaries, thus in April 1861 Kay-Shuttleworth wrote that the Commission was established "chiefly in consequence of the questions raised by the increase of the charge on the public revenue", (1) and has subsequently been neglected by historians. In consequence one of the major purposes of the Revised Code has been overlooked. The Code has been variously interpreted, as an instrument of social control, as a natural development of a wider concern for economy and efficiency, as an exercise in secularization, as a crash course in literacy. (2) But the Code was also the means employed by the Liberal Government, and especially by such politicians within it as Gladstone, Granville and Lowe, to avoid the necessity of introducing an education bill at that time, and in particular to reject the principle of local education agencies and finance. (3)

Pakington's commitment to the cause of national education, however, was such that he did not give up the struggle but merely adopted a new plan of campaign. He now decided to justify his drive for local education agencies by revealing the deficiencies and ineffectiveness

---

(1) J. Kay-Shuttleworth, Four Periods of Popular Education (1862), 555.

(2) The Revised Code still excites controversy and is being researched by A.J. Marcham for a London University Ph.D. thesis. On 17 October 1974, in the Institute of Historical Research, Mr Marcham presented an important paper entitled 'Interpretations of the Revised Code of Education 1862' to members of Professor Charlton's higher degree research seminar.

(3) For the subsequent attempts of Lowe and Gladstone to justify their actions see pp. 249-50 and 269-70 of this thesis.

of the Privy Council system, the Department, and the attitudes of some of its personnel. He had already found one chink in Lowe's armour, the antipathy which existed between the Vice-President and some of the inspectors. He also found allies in this cause, unexpected names, Cecil, Forster and Walter among them. An attack was launched on the credibility of Lowe, Granville and Lingen, an attack which after the resignation of Lowe in 1864 and the Reports of Pakington's Select Committee of 1865-6, showed the bankruptcy of the Privy Council system, and of the Revised Code as a policy for national education, and secured the defeat of its progenitors. With that purpose accomplished, the way was at last clear for the achievement of an education act of the type which Pakington had hoped would follow the Report of the Newcastle Commission in 1861-2.

Chapter Seven

INSPECTORS' REPORTS AND THE SELECT COMMITTEE, 1862-1866

In the years 1862-4 Pakington had three major objectives in view. The first was to hold a watching brief over the Revised Code itself, to call attention to its details, to expose its weaknesses, and to highlight irregularities in its presentation and implementation. A second intention was to question the credibility of the Code's perpetrators, to harry Lowe and by implication Granville and Lingen too. Pakington's approach to this task, however, was based upon fundamental principles and not upon spite or personal bitterness. His third aim was to demonstrate the unsatisfactory nature of the Privy Council system, unsatisfactory in its constitution, in its existing operation, and as the means for securing national education. Though these three concerns led ultimately to the appointment of the Select Committee of 1865-6, the issue which first fused them together, and provided a focus for all the discontent which the Revised Code and the parliamentary debates upon it had engendered was that which Pakington had interjected into the Commons debate on 14 August 1860, "Can you not trust your inspectors?" (1) In 1864, when this matter came to a head, both Granville (2) and Lowe tendered their resignations, and the way was prepared for Pakington's major inquiry into the Privy Council system, the Education Department, and the best means of promoting national education.

In 1862 one of Pakington's lines of resistance to the Revised Code in general, and to Lowe in particular, had been "that the course he pursued of laying the Code

---

(1) Hansard, CLX, 1293, 14 August 1860.
(2) Granville was persuaded to continue in office.

upon the table upon almost the last night of the Session was not in consonance with that frankness and fair dealing towards the representatives of the people," [1] which (he claimed) had generally characterized the Palmerstonian style of government. He was concerned to ensure that any subsequent Minutes or major revisions of the Code should be so presented as to allow adequate time for their consideration, especially as Sections 150 and 151 [2] of the Code were (in his view) specifically intended to give Parliament, and the schools themselves, some protection from too-frequent and too-rapid changes within the system. Thus on 15 June 1863 Pakington complained to Lowe that on 19 May an order had been issued nullifying Section 136 [3] of the Code, in direct contravention of the principles of Sections 150 and 151. He had expected that new Minutes would be introduced only at the beginning of the year, and the whole embodied in the new Code and laid upon the table for the sanction of Parliament. [4] Lowe's interpretation, however, was "that where a new Minute was made, it should be laid before the House of Commons for one month before it became law; and in addition to that security the Code was to be printed with the new Minutes made once a year, so that the House should have the opportunity not only of seeing a

---

(1) Hansard, CLXV, 253, 13 February 1862. Pakington attempted to appeal to Palmerston over Lowe's head on this point, e.g. Hansard CLXVI, 859, 11 April 1862, and ibid., 1128, 2 May 1862.

(2) "In January of each year, if the Code be revised, or any material alteration in it be necessary, it shall be printed in such a form as to show separately all articles cancelled or modified, and all new articles."

"In the event of such revision or material alteration as mentioned in the last foregoing article, it shall not be lawful to take any action thereon until the same shall have been submitted to Parliament, and laid on the table of both Houses at least one calendar month."

(3) This related to endowments. The point is considered in more detail later in this chapter.

(4) See, for example, Pakington's interpretations of articles 150 and 151 in Hansard, CLXXV, 381, 12 May 1864, and Hansard, CLXXVI, 548, 30 June 1864.

Minute at the time it was passed, but have a collective view each year of all the Minutes and changes made." (1) Pakington continued to press this point, and asked Lowe for the Committee of Council's construction both of Sections 150 and 151, and of the proper time for taking exception in the Commons to a new Minute. (2) Lowe's reply was that Minutes would be acted upon one month after being laid before the House, and that consequently objections should be made during that month. Pakington's campaign for a consolidated Code, published in January, to include all changes to be made in the coming session, was intended to prevent over-frequent tinkering with the system, to allow M.P.'s the opportunity of examining changes in a balanced and overall manner, and to place the Minutes rather in the form of a parliamentary bill, than of a mere administrative device. His dissatisfaction on this issue was one of the major factors in his determination to secure a full inquiry into the workings of the Privy Council system and the Education Department.

Pakington's attack upon the authors and agents of the Revised Code naturally concentrated upon Lowe. But he by no means held Lowe solely responsible for the policies and shortcomings of the Department, and indeed in 1864 he declared that "I do not think it was he who ought to have resigned, but rather Earl Granville, the head of the Department." (3) Moreover though the parliamentary exchanges between Pakington and Lowe at this period were forceful, they were generally courteous. Lowe, for example, acknowledged that Pakington "had held a far higher office than that which he (Mr. Lowe) had the honour of filling." (4) Two years later Lowe, now

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXI, 953, 15 June 1863.
(2) Hansard, CLXXI, 1042, 18 June 1863.
(3) Hansard, CLXXV, 377, 12 May 1864.
(4) Hansard, CLXX, 24, 27 March 1863.

"unfettered by office", wrote from Sherbrooke in warm terms complimenting Pakington on his "excellent speech at Worcester on the Conscience Clause," and referring to Pakington's "liberal and enlightened ideas on National Education." (1) The Conscience Clause was one issue on which Pakington and Lowe were in general accord, and since Lowe's principal motivation was simply reduction of expenditure, Pakington's strictures upon the National Society for resisting the insertion of conscience clauses met with Lowe's approval. (2)

But Pakington and Lowe continued to differ upon the more crucial issues of government responsibility for and expenditure upon education. That difference was never more clearly shown than in the peroration to Lowe's speech on an Education resolution moved by John Walter, Liberal M.P. for Berkshire.

"Let the House remember in conclusion, that this Department differs in one important respect from the Department of War, or of the Navy, or any of the great Departments of Government. There you may reasonably hope that by an increased expenditure you will obtain greater efficiency. The more money you spend, the more men, the more artillery, or the more ships you will get. It is not so with this Department, which depends upon its efficiency as a check to expenditure. If you break down that efficiency, you will increase expenditure; but exactly in proportion as you increase expenditure do you diminish the utility of the Department, do you frustrate the purpose it was intended to answer, and do you involve the country in endless expense, every additional thousand pounds of which only leads to less substantial results." (3)

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/2/(v11)/M/P/79, Lowe to Pakington, 20 January 1865.

(2) Hansard, CLXXVI, 548-9, 30 June 1864. Correspondence between the Education Department and the National Society on this issue had recently been laid on the table of the Commons.

(3) Hansard, CLXX, 1206-7, 5 May 1863. This was an interesting comparison, particularly inasmuch as the bulk of Pakington's own ministerial career was spent at the Admiralty and War Office.

Pakington dissented firmly from that opinion, and was encouraged to find that some of the newer members of the Commons shared his views. He also believed that many of those officially and specifically charged with superintending and assessing the development of schooling, the H.M.I.'s, were profoundly concerned about some of the results of the Revised Code, and that their reports to this effect were being systematically doctored or suppressed. Consequently, in the years 1863 and 1864, Pakington concentrated his parliamentary attack upon the issue of inspectors' reports, as that most likely to focus attention upon the unsatisfactory nature of the Privy Council system, the divisions of responsibility within the Education Department, the weaknesses of the Revised Code, and the dictatorial and irrational policy of its authors.

From 1844 until 1858 the annual reports of H.M.I.'s had been published in full. As early as 1851, however, inspectors had been urged to be as concise as possible. Though collected and printed annually, detailed reports on individual schools, had never been laid before Parliament, as had been the case with the general reports. In 1858, on the grounds of economy, Adderley had proposed substituting a digest of the general reports, but Whig-Liberal opposition which included Palmerston, Cowper, Milner Gibson and Russell, persuaded the Conservative Government to resort once more to the device of urging the inspectors to be concise and publishing the whole. (1) Pakington's charges in 1863 and 1864, however, were more serious. It was not merely that reports were being condensed but that facts and conclusions within them which did not support the opinions of the Vice-President and the Secretary were being systematically excluded.

---

(1) For the major debate on this issue see Hansard, CLII, 695-714, 22 February 1859.

Thus Parliament was being denied its rightful access to information by the prejudices of its servants. (1)

Pakington first questioned Lowe on this issue on 27 March 1863. He then asked "Whether the Report of the Reverend Mr. Watkins (2) last year, and the Reports of other Inspectors in the last two years, have been altogether suppressed or much altered in the Annual Report from the Committee of Council; and, if so, what were the reasons for any such suppression or alteration; and whether there is any objection to lay such suppressed Reports on the table of this House?" (3) Lowe replied that a Minute (4) had been issued some two years earlier prescribing certain limits. "Whenever a Report appeared to them to wander beyond the prescribed limits it was to be sent back to the Inspector, with a direction to him to make it conform to the Minute, intimating, at the same time, that if he failed to do so, the Report would not be printed or laid before Parliament." (5) Of the twenty-eight chief inspectors who were entitled to present reports, Lowe announced, three had refused to make the required amendments in the first year of the new scheme and three in the current year. These reports were consequently not printed. Watkins' name appeared in both lists, his reports contained "a great deal of

---

(1) Cowper on 22 February 1859 had urged that "Of all the blue-books, the Reports of the School Inspectors had the most readers." Ibid., 696.
(2) Reverend Frederick Watkins, an inspector for nearly thirty years. Pakington had quoted from his reports on previous occasions.
(3) Hansard, CLXX, 22, 27 March 1863.
(4) Article 14 of the Revised Code, "The inspectors ... are employed to verify the fulfilment of the conditions on which grants are made, to collect information, and to report the results to the Committee of Council." Report of the Committee of Council on Education (1861-2), xvii.
(5) Hansard, CLXX, 23, 27 March 1863.

speculative and controversial matter," and Lowe therefore refused to comply with Pakington's request to lay the suppressed reports upon the table of the House.

Pakington was not to be denied, and in 1864 for example he bombarded Lowe with questions. Firstly, when would the Annual Report of the Committee of Council be laid before Parliament? Secondly, was it true that reports would be required from only half the inspectors? Thirdly, would reports be presented to the House "in the usual manner and without omission or mutilation?" (1) Lowe's replies were studied and cautious. The Report would be available early in June, only half the inspectors would be required to report because the distinction between chief and assistant inspector had been abolished, and were all to report the annual cost of £2,000 would be doubled. On the third question Lowe was evasive. He advised that reports would be presented in the usual manner, and repeated his answer of the previous year on the delicate issue of "mutilation or omission". When Pakington pressed on to ask "whether all the Reports so sent in would be laid on the table without the suppression of any of them?" Lowe replied that "he could not answer the question until he had made himself master of the Reports." (2)

Whether Pakington, unaided, could have made any further progress on this issue is doubtful. He lacked official Conservative backing, and indeed Adderley, who had himself experienced the reports' problem in 1858-9, showed considerable sympathy at this time with Lowe's attitudes on inspectors' reports (3) and the Revised Code. (4) He too believed that the role of the inspectors was to make

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXIII, 1823, 11 March 1864.
(2) Ibid., 1824.
(3) Hansard, CLXXI, 726-8, 11 June 1863.
(4) Hansard, CLXX, 1211-16, 5 May 1863.

reports on schools and not to comment on policy. But Pakington now received the support of those who had suffered from Lowe's caustic invective during the Revised Code debates. Lord Robert Cecil, for example, whose championship of the denominational system had earlier led him to oppose all Pakington's educational plans, was now strongly opposed to Lowe and to the Code. On 21 February 1862 he had tellingly shown that although Lowe had promised that the new Code would not be implemented until it had been fully discussed in Parliament, the managers of the Derby Road School, Nottingham, had already been denied a grant for books and apparatus under the new regulations. A week later, on 28 February, Cecil was also able to show that the new pupil-teacher regulations were being put into effect. (1) Lowe on these occasions pleaded administrative discretion, though administrative indiscretion would perhaps have been a more fitting description. Whilst Cecil still saw Pakington's proposals for rate-aided schemes as the ultimate danger to denominational education, his attacks on Lowe became from 1862 both bitter and personal, (2) and he came to see the issue of inspectors' reports as a means of securing revenge. W.E. Forster, (3) though at the opposite end of the political spectrum from Cecil, held him in personal esteem. As he wrote to de Grey on 19 December 1858, "I have rarely seen a man I more draw to than Lord Robert Cecil." (4) Lowe, on the other hand, held Forster in particular contempt. He wrote to Granville on 21 October 1864, "Forster is not the least to be trusted in Church and education matters,

---

(1) Hansard, CLXV, 595-6, 21 February 1862, and ibid., 872-8, 28 February 1862.
(2) Hansard, CLXVI, 1233-7, 5 May 1862, Cecil's speech in the Revised Code debate which illustrates both these attitudes.
(3) William Edward Forster (1818-1886). Liberal M.P. for Bradford, 1861-86.
(4) Quoted in L. Wolf, Life of the first Marquess of Ripon (2 vols., 1921), I, 163.

and wants education himself." (1) Pakington's third important supporter was John Walter. (2) Walter preserved a nice distinction between his political and publishing activities, but if, as proprietor of The Times, he expected any deference in the Commons from Lowe, one of the paper's leader writers, he was disappointed. Thus Lowe in 1863 took Walter to task for a speech in favour of granting government aid to efficient schools conducted by uncertificated teachers, and advised Walter that he "should have taken the trouble to acquire that information which could alone enable him to deal with this subject." (3) Walter and Forster both saw the extension of grants to the unassisted and poorer schools as the best means of promoting national education at this time, and as they began to understand Lowe and the Department's implacable hostility to this course of action, they too, like Cecil, came to follow Pakington's lead on the matter of inspectors' reports. Thus on 11 June 1863, Forster, having made reference to Pakington's initiative and questions earlier in the session, now used stronger language in concluding that Lowe intended "to suppress everything in the Reports which did not coincide with his own views, and to publish only what he himself approved ... Mr. Watkins's crime was that he had been so irreverent and blasphemous as to contravert opinions of the Vice-President." (4) Walter and Cecil lent their support on this occasion, and when, later that evening, the Education estimate was moved, both

---

(1) Quoted in E. Fitzmaurice, Life of Granville (1905), I, 433.
(2) John Walter (1818-1894). Entered Parliament in 1847 as M.P. for Nottingham. Liberal M.P. for Berkshire 1859-65 and 1868-85.
(3) Hansard, CLXX, 1188, 5 May 1863. Walter had, however, earlier in the debate, ibid., 1170, advised the House that he could "no longer place that confidence in the reports of the Inspectors which I desire to do."
(4) Hansard, CLXXI, 718-19, 11 June 1863.

Forster and Walter took the opportunity to return to the issue.

In the Spring of 1864 matters reached a head. Even Adderley, who had normally shown some appreciation of the Vice-President's difficulties, now characterized Lowe as "a very clever Minister, who had talents equal to a place in the Cabinet, and who had to let off the steam of superfluous energy which was pent up in a too narrow office." (1) That declaration of Conservative disenchantment was made on 8 March. Three days later came Pakington's three questions on the reports' issue and Lowe's unsatisfactory reply. (2) Tension was then heightened by the dismissal and apparent victimisation of H.M.I. J.R. Morell. Cecil took up Morell's case on 5 April, (3) and a week later moved the fatal resolution, "That, in the opinion of this House the mutilation of the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, and the exclusion from them of statements and opinions adverse to the educational views entertained by the Committee of Council, while matter favourable to them is admitted, are violations of the understanding under which the appointment of the Inspectors was originally sanctioned by Parliament, and tend entirely to destroy the value of their Reports." What ensued that evening was no dry nor dusty debate, but high drama. Papers purporting to show how alterations had been made in reports were being passed round the Chamber, though Cecil declined to quote inspectors by name "for fear of the vengeance which might descend on the head of

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXIII, 1666, 8 March 1864.
(2) Hansard, CLXXIII, 1823-4, 11 March 1864.
(3) Hansard, CLXXIV, 478-9, 5 April 1864. There is a useful summary of the Morell case in J. Hurt, Education in Evolution (1971), 54-6, which draws upon J.R. Morell, The Case of Mr. J.R. Morell (1864).

the unfortunate wight who supplied it." (1) Walter who seconded the resolution showed how two reports which commented upon the inefficiency of uncertificated teachers were approved, whilst one which commended a school run by an uncertificated teacher had had that passage struck out. Apart from a short speech by Sir George Grey, Lowe was left undefended by his Ministerial colleagues. Lowe himself, infuriated by Cecil's collusion with Morell, a dismissed public servant, unavailingly maintained that no passages were struck out, and that no reports had been returned to inspectors in the current year. The resolution was approved by 101 votes to 93, and Granville and Lowe tendered their resignations. Pakington voted with the majority. (2)

Though the vote of 1864 and Lowe's resignation were the preliminary to the establishment of the Select Committee of 1865, Pakington was also responsible at this time for helping to secure the appointment of another wide-ranging inquiry into education, the Taunton Commission. (3) Pakington has indeed received some recognition as the parent of this third of the trio of Royal Commissions of

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXIV, 899, 12 April 1864.
(2) Analysis of the vote using Dod's Parliamentary Companion for 1864 shows, 70 Conservatives, 17 Liberal Conservatives, 8 Irish Liberals, 3 Liberals, 1 Liberal Tory, 1 Whig and 1 Radical Reformer in the majority. The minority included 83 Liberals, 4 Liberal Conservatives, 2 Radical Reformers, 1 Whig, 1 Radical, 1 Reformer, and Cobden who is unclassified.
(3) The Report of the Commissioners has been called "the most complete sociological information pertaining to education ever assembled in this country." B. Simon, The Two Nations and the Educational Structure, 1780-1870 (1974), 320. The importance of further thorough investigation at the local level, however, has been shown by David Allsobrook, 'The Reform of the Endowed Schools: the work of the Northamptonshire Educational Society 1854-1874', History of Education, II(1), 1973; and G. Gomez, 'The Endowed Schools Act, 1869 - A Middle-Class Conspiracy? The South-West Lancashire Evidence', Journal of Educational Administration and History, VI(1), 1974.

the mid-nineteenth century. Fitzmaurice noted that "A motion was made in the House of Commons urging some action by Sir John Pakington and accepted by the Government," (1) whilst A.S. Bishop has described how "In 1864, therefore, at the request of Sir John Pakington, the government was prevailed upon to appoint a third Royal Commission." (2) Though Pakington in his own evidence to the Taunton Commission commented that he had given attention "perhaps not so much to the education of the middle classes as to that of the labouring classes," (3) his concept of education was truly national and envisaged the provision of good schooling for all classes of society.

Pakington's particular concern in 1863 and 1864 was the issue of educational endowments. This important matter, originally spotlighted by Brougham's inquiries in the second decade of the century, had been more recently investigated by the Newcastle Commissioners. Their Report had recommended "that the Committee of Council on Education become the Committee of Council on Education and Charities," that endowed schools, both middle and elementary should be annually inspected, and that the Privy Council should promote, where necessary, the combination

---

(1) E. Fitzmaurice, Life of Granville (1905), I, 432. There are some interesting extracts from the Granville Mss. included in an article by A. Robertson, ' "But What is a Middle Class School?" Determining the Terms of Reference of the Taunton Commission, 1864', History of Education Society Bulletin, XVI, 1975.

(2) A.S. Bishop, The Rise of a Central Authority for English Education (1971), 221.

(3) P.P. 1867-8, xxviii, Report of the Royal Commissioners on Schools not comprised within Her Majesty's two recent Commissions on Popular Education and Public Schools, III, 674. Pakington gave evidence on 14 June 1865. His replies, 7013-81, are found in pp. 674-83. (xxviii (III) is vol. IV of the Report.)

of small endowments, an improved distribution of endowment income, and "the adaptation of the instruction given in endowed schools to the requirements of the class to which it ought to be given." (1)

In the early 1860's two major controversies arose concerning endowed schools. The first, precipitated by the work of Llewelyn Dillwyn, Liberal M.P. for Swansea, concerned the rights of Dissenters. Dillwyn was particularly offended by the assumption of the Anglican church that it controlled all endowed schools in which no specific religious requirements had been prescribed, and in 1859, he therefore introduced a Bill into the Commons to establish beyond doubt that Dissenters were entitled to act as trustees for endowed schools. Though the Bill was withdrawn in August Pakington, as a member of the Select Committee to which it had been referred, had the opportunity of examining some of the problems which surrounded the issue. (2) Ten years later, after the labours of the Taunton Commission, Pakington had the satisfaction of being appointed a member of the Select Committee on Forster's successful Endowed Schools Bill of 1869.

The second controversy, and one in which Pakington played a leading part, centred upon the Minute of 19 May 1863. Article 136 of the Code had forbidden the payment of Privy Council grants to schools where the endowment exceeded 30 shillings per scholar per annum, but as Pakington protested in the Commons on 15 June 1863, "... on

---

(1) P.P. 1861, xxi, I, 547-9. Section V of the recommendations, nos. 22-30, was entitled "Better application of Educational and other Charities".

(2) Lord Cranworth also introduced an unsuccessful Endowed Schools Bill into the Lords in 1859. In 1860 there were further bills from Dillwyn, Adderley and Cranworth. Dillwyn toyed with introducing further legislation in 1862 and 1863.

the 19th of May an order was issued by the Privy Council completely annulling the arrangement; by declaring that all grants should be lowered by the amount of any annual endowment. That was a grave matter of complaint." (1) Pakington received official Conservative support on this issue, for many of the National schools would be affected. Derby spoke against the new Minute in the Lords on 27 July 1863, when the Duke of Somerset, in Granville's absence, replied for the Government that if the purpose of the Privy Council grants were to assist, those schools with endowments needed less assistance. Such an argument was logical enough, but was it consistent with Lowe's Commons statements to the effect that grants should not be made in accordance with the needs and requirements of schools, but in relation to their support and achievements?

Accordingly on 8 March 1864 Adderley moved, "That Grants made from the Treasury to Schools for the working classes, should not, in every case, be reduced by the whole amount of all endowments." (2) Lowe, after advancing several arguments against the resolution, promised to try to accept it. A new Minute was issued on 11 March 1864, (3) but the Conservative resolution moved by Adderley, "That this House having considered the Minute of Council of the 11th day of March 1864, on Endowed Schools, is of opinion that it does not meet the objections made to the Minute of the 19th day of May," (4) was only narrowly defeated by 119 votes to 111.

Pakington refused to allow the matter to rest there. On 30 June, four weeks after this narrow defeat, he sought

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXI, 952, 15 June 1863. Pakington's protest fell within the period of one month's grace before the implementation of the new Minute.
(2) Hansard, CLXXIII, 1670, 8 March 1864.
(3) The Minute of 11 March 1864 made no deduction of the endowment in the case of small rural schools, but continued to do so in urban areas.
(4) Hansard, CLXXV, 1075, 2 June 1864.

the House's opinion on whether he could proceed with his own motion which deplored the distinction made by the Minute of 11 March 1864 between endowed schools in rural and urban areas, but the Speaker ruled against him. Pakington accepted that judgement with good grace, but he also used the opportunity to inform the Commons that, "In his opinion the policy of the Government with regard to Endowed Schools was unrighteous and unwise, and he thought that if any hon. Member would refer to that part of the Report of the Royal Commission which related to the establishment of these Endowed Schools he could only arrive at the conclusion, that if we had an Educational Department, with a responsible Minister at its head, it would be impossible for that Minister not to feel that it would be his duty to avail himself of the endowments, in order to improve and extend education throughout many districts of the country, and not to lend himself to the unworthy policy of saving a few thousands of the annual charge at the expense of impeding the education of the people." (1) Pakington declared that in the next session he would revive the discussion and induce the House to reverse its decision. In the event his persistence was rewarded, and on 5 May 1865 Bruce laid upon the table a new Minute which "proposed to extend to all schools that concession which was made by the Minute of March 1864, to rural schools alone." (2)

Pakington's reference, in his speech of 30 June 1864 on the endowed schools issue, to "an Educational Department, with a responsible Minister at its head," exemplified his main concern in the years following 1862, namely to show

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXVI, 498, 30 June 1864.
(2) Hansard, CLXXVIII, 1537, 5 May 1865.

that only a fundamental reform of the constitution of the Committee of Privy Council and the Education Department, and of their policies, could secure national education. The very system which had been created to promote, or at least to assist, the development of national education, had become, in Pakington's view, the major impediment to its further progress.

It could be argued that Pakington, whose pressure for reform had led to the creation of the Vice-Presidency and the Education Department in 1856, had, after Russell, been the chief progenitor of the system he was now attempting to overturn. Nevertheless Pakington in 1855 and 1856 had not campaigned merely to add a Vice-Presidency to an already unwieldy system of a Lord President and Committee of Privy Council, but to replace it by a proper and separate department of state headed by a single Cabinet minister, whose prime responsibility would be to achieve national education.

Before 1862 Pakington had moderated his criticisms, but when the Revised Code had been finally and formally accepted and instituted, and his own plans for the establishment of local educational agencies and rating by parliamentary statute defeated, he launched into a sustained campaign which culminated in the appointment of the Select Committee of 1865. The opening salvoes were fired in autumn 1862 at Edinburgh, when in his address to the Philosophical Institution, Pakington characterized the Privy Council system as "an accident, a provisional arrangement, a temporary expedient which, while Parliament had been unable to agree upon anything better had grown and extended till it stood in the way of real amendment, and afforded a handle to those who desired to impede principles which had been successful in other countries." (1) But his most effective speeches were two delivered in the Commons on 12 May 1864 and 28 February 1865, in the wake

---

(1) The Times, 1 November 1862.

of Lowe's resignation.

Lowe's explanation of 18 April 1864 that marks on inspectors' reports were necessitated by his own poor eyesight, occasioned some embarrassment for Cecil, Forster and Walter, who now maintained that the resolution of 12 April had been not an attack upon Lowe's honour but on the policy of the Education Department. Nevertheless, Cecil commented, the confusion which existed arose not from his resolution but from within the Government, or the Privy Council system itself. "The House passed a resolution condemning the Government. The Government said 'Oh no! It is the Privy Council'. The Privy Council was represented by the Lord President, but the Lord President said it was the Vice-President. The Vice-President resigned and proved that he was innocent, and they inquire further, and find out that it was the Secretary." (1) On 12 May Sir George Grey, in the absence of Palmerston, proposed "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the practice of the Committee of Council on Education with respect to the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools," (2) and Pakington took the opportunity to move an amendment to add "and further to inquire into the constitution of that Committee, and how far their mode of conducting the business of the department is consistent with the due control of Parliament over the annual Education Grants." That amendment was rightly rejected on 12 May, inasmuch as the immediate issue of inspectors' reports required speedy settlement, but Pakington's speech (3) on that occasion prepared the way for the appointment of the Select Committee in the following year.

He began with an expression of sympathy towards Lowe, and a warm welcome to Bruce, the new Vice-President. But

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXV, 391, 12 May 1864.
(2) Ibid., 371.
(3) Ibid., 371-82.

his prime task was to address himself to an analysis of why "a deep feeling of dissatisfaction and distrust of the administration of the Educational Department prevails throughout the country." (1) In so doing Pakington advanced four major arguments to justify his amendment. He asked firstly why the superintendence of education should be based upon principles which differed from those of every other department of state, and his statement of these principles has found a place in nineteenth-century constitutional and administrative history: "Under our Parliamentary system, it is the object and desire of the country that at the head of each Department there should be a man whose time, attention, and mind are concentrated on it, and who has full control over it, subject only to the general check of the Cabinet and of the responsibility which he owes to Parliament. That is the system under which the great Departments of State are administered... ." (2)

Pakington's second line of argument was to examine the institution of the Vice-Presidency in 1856 and to show how in the general desire to secure some specific representation of the Education Department in the Commons, the trenchant criticisms, which proceeded from members of both parties, of Granville's Bill, had been insufficiently heeded. Pakington produced several quotations from the Lords' debate; from Derby, who had asked "whether it would not be well to supersede the Privy Council altogether in this matter;" from Ellenborough, who had advised that "If they wished to have a department well conducted, they should rather place it in the hands of one than of two Ministers, however able;" from Earl Grey, who had "... concurred in the opinion that it would be better to dissociate the Presidency of Council from the superintendence of the

---

(1) Ibid., 373.
(2) Ibid., 373-4. This quotation is printed in H.J. Hanham, The Nineteenth-Century Constitution (1969), 347.

Educational Department:" and from Monteagle who had warned that "A Board or Committee of Education, as appointed under the old system was in principle and constitution one of the worst modes of administration." (1) Such prophecies had been fulfilled by 1864. As had happened at the Board of Trade and the Board of Control, subordinate officers had come to assume considerable responsibility. In 1856, on the third reading of the Education Bill, Gladstone had indeed specifically called attention to the unsatisfactory nature of the Board of Trade in which the Vice-President had often come to be more important than the President, especially when the former sat in the Commons and the latter in the Lords. In 1864 Lowe had claimed to be merely a subordinate, but both he and Granville had offered their resignations. Pakington's Select Committee was to reveal the full extent of the confusion which had developed since 1856, and it is noteworthy that Granville and Lowe were each recognised as "Minister of Education, 1859-1864" by their respective biographers. (2) Pakington's own experience of ministerial office qualified him to comment upon the practice of such departments. The Board of Control had not met for some thirty years, the Committee of Council on Trade had long ceased to act, and the President of the Board of Trade had no other duties to perform, as had the Lord President of the Council. Finally, though Pakington had some grave misgivings concerning the Board of Admiralty, (3) its members were specifically appointed for their experience and interest in naval matters.

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXV, 375, 12 May 1864, quoting from Hansard, CXL, 815-21, 15 February 1856.

(2) E. Fitzmaurice, Life of Granville (1905), I, 414-39, Ch. XV is entitled 'Lord Granville as Minister of Education, 1859-1864'. A.P. Martin, Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Robert Lowe (2 vols., 1893), II, 210-35, Ch. XIII is entitled 'Minister of Education (1859-1864)'.

(3) See, for example, Hansard, CLXXVIII, 697-700, 3 April 1865.

Thus Pakington argued, thirdly, that the Committee of Council on Education suffered even in comparison with these admittedly unsatisfactory departments. In 1864 the Committee supposedly consisted of the Lord President, the Lord Privy Seal, the First Lord of the Admiralty, Earl Russell, the Prime Minister, the President of the Poor Law Board, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Vice-President. A meeting of the Committee on Saturday 7 May 1864 to consider the fate of the Endowment Minute had been attended by six members, (1) and the Home Secretary, (2) but Pakington doubted, however, whether the minds of many of those present had been devoted to consideration of the Minute, or rather to more pressing matters of state for which they were specifically and individually responsible. Pakington's own experience of membership of the Committee in 1858-9 had been perfunctory to say the least. "I can remember only one occasion on which we met together as members of the Council, and that the impression then created was that we were interfering with the business of other men who could do it better. The experiment was not accordingly repeated, and it was left to my right hon. Friend (3) near me and the President of the Council to discharge the whole duties of the Office." (4)

Finally, Pakington sought to show that the grave theoretical objections which existed in relation to the Committee of Privy Council system could not be countered by arguments that all worked well in practice. Indeed, on the contrary, he took the example of reversals of policy on the endowment issue in the two years since the Revised Code to argue that "If the Education Department had been under the guidance of a single man, acting under a full sense of responsibility, that subject would never have

---

(1) Palmerston and Russell were the two absentees.
(2) Sir George Grey.
(3) Adderley.
(4) Hansard, CLXXV, 378, 12 May 1864.

been treated with the carelessness and levity which led to such a result." (1) Another unsatisfactory example cited by Pakington were the Supplementary Rules published in September 1863. He claimed that Parliament had no official knowledge of them, and, as evidence to his Select Committee would confirm, many school managers and teachers were ignorant of them until the inspector called to conduct the examination. Moreover, Pakington claimed, the Rules were in direct contravention both of the Revised Code itself and of the Report of the Committee of Council of 1862 in not allowing children freely to be presented for examination "according to standards selected for them in the first instance by those interested in their success." Pakington urged yet again that new Minutes should be submitted to Parliament only at the beginning of the year, and that the new Vice-President should address himself to the issue of local agency, warning Bruce that "the impression unhappily does prevail that the present Government care much more about the reduction of the grant than about the promotion of education." (2)

Pakington's amendment was defeated by 142 votes to 93 on 12 May 1864, but there were further problems before the Select Committee on Inspectors' Reports was finally established. The question at issue was whether this Committee was a genuine inquiry into the practice of the Education Department in this matter, or an investigation into the personal conduct of the Vice-President. Lowe himself declined to serve, and Palmerston on 31 May nominated a Committee of fifteen in which Pakington's name stood second after that of Bruce, and on which Cecil, Forster and Walter were all to serve. There was, however, considerable feeling in the House that if Lowe were not to be a member, his accusers should also be excluded, and accordingly, after some debate, and further reflection by

---

(1) Ibid., 379.
(2) Ibid., 380.

the Government, a Committee of five impartial members was appointed on 7 June, with Moncrieff and Cecil as non-voting assessors. The Committee worked swiftly, and the House on 25 July 1864, having considered the Report, agreed that the resolution of 12 April should be rescinded. (1)

Henry Austin Bruce, the new Vice-President, whose appointment Pakington had so warmly welcomed, had a genuine interest in education. When in 1874, as Lord Aberdare, he found his political career virtually at an end, he devoted the remaining years of his long life to improving education in the Principality, becoming in 1894 first Chancellor of the University of Wales. Though no major policy changes were immediately instituted in 1864, and though the political excitement surrounding education had dispersed, (on 30 June 1864, when Bruce presented the Education estimates there were only three members (2) on the opposition benches) Bruce's generally conciliatory and constructive approach augured well. Indeed on that occasion Pakington advised Bruce to re-examine the Report of the Newcastle Commission, and particularly the issue of local agency, to consider the justice of using nearly one million of money taken from taxes for the benefit of a mere fraction of the population, to seek final solutions to such hoary issues as the Conscience Clause, and to give a ruling on the presentation of Minutes to Parliament. In response, on 17 February 1865, Bruce presented a Revised Code of Regulations incorporating the Minutes of 11 March 1864 and 8 February 1865, a statement on the procedure for issuing Minutes,

---

(1) Pakington argued for a Committee of fifteen, Hansard, CLXXV, 991-3, 31 May 1864. He consistently maintained that the issue to be investigated was the practice of the Department, rather than the personal honour of Lowe.

(2) Pakington, Adderley and Cecil.

and announced that the Government had accepted the proposal of Miss Angela Burdett-Coutts [1] to allow the amalgamation, under certain conditions, of small rural schools for the purpose of receiving government financial aid.

During the summer and autumn of 1864 Pakington made preparations for moving, early in the new session, for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the constitution of the Committee of Council and the Education Department. Lowe was one who tried to dissuade him from this course, and he wrote to Pakington early in 1865 advising "that it is my deliberate opinion that exactly in proportion to the degree in which you succeed in weakening or discrediting that department, you cripple the only influence in this country favourable to your own liberal and enlightened ideas on National Education." [2] One supporter, however, was Walter, who on 30 June 1864 had given notice of his own intention to move for an inquiry into the fact that many schools were excluded from the government grants. Walter doubted whether it would be possible to secure the appointment of two committees on education in the same year, and he accordingly approached Pakington, and the Government, to inquire whether his own concern for the unassisted schools could be added to the agenda of Pakington's proposed committee. Both parties signified their assent, [3] and consequently on 28 February 1865, when the Commons debated the issue, Pakington and Walter acted in concert. In spite of Lowe's opposition both to the motion and to the amendment, the Select Committee was approved. Pakington's motion read

---

(1) See her letter to The Times, 19 January 1865.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/2/(vii)/M/P/79, Lowe to Pakington, 20 January 1865.
(3) Indeed Pakington was to declare that he had himself considered incorporating such a section in his proposal.

"That a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire into the Constitution of the Committee of Council on Education, and the system under which the business of the office is conducted," to which was added Walter's amendment, "and also into the best mode of extending the benefits of Government Inspection and the Parliamentary Grant to Schools at present unassisted by the State." (1)

In moving for the Select Committee, Pakington (2) studiously avoided contentious issues from the past, and eschewed any detailed examination of such matters as the Revised Code, Inspectors' Reports, or the Endowment Minute. His object was "a reorganization of the Department intrusted with the superintendence of the education of the people, as may make it better adapted than it is now for the important functions it has to perform," and more particularly "to extend the assistance now given for educational purposes, which goes now only to the more favoured and more wealthy districts which now enjoy the benefits of national aid, to the whole of England." (3) He repeated many of the arguments contained in his speech of 12 May. The distrust of the Education Department, the background to the Act of 1856, the constitution and workings of the Committee of Council, were once more systematically examined. But he also adduced new evidence. In 1839 Russell had argued that it was not intended that the Committee of Council should superintend the whole education of the country. In their evidence to the Newcastle Commission Lingen and Chester had shown the Department's difficulties in coping with the system as it existed some twenty years later. But Pakington argued that, rather than trim education to correspond with the capacities of the Department, as Lingen wished, the next step should be

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXVII, 926, 28 February 1865.
(2) Ibid., 847-58.
(3) Ibid., 847-8.

so to reconstitute the Department as to enable it to supply national education. Pakington welcomed the new Minute which enabled combinations of two and not more than six parishes having small schools to employ a certificated teacher between them and thus be eligible for the parliamentary grants, but he asked why a government department which had been in existence for over a quarter of a century had acted in this matter only on the initiative of Miss Burdett-Coutts. A more valuable step, Pakington urged, would be to group together parishes which had no good school at all. Though Bruce might argue that he had no power so to do, Pakington's riposte would be that, "if you had a vigorous and effective Minister at the head of the Department, he would have sought and obtained the power to combine these parishes years and years ago." (1) Pakington was able to quote from the most recent Report of the Committee of Council which showed "that out of the whole 15,000 parishes in England there are not less than 11,024 receiving no advantage whatever from the large grants annually made by Parliament for the promotion of education." (2) He calculated that the unassisted parishes contained some six million people who thus received no benefit whatever from the annual votes for education. Walter, who followed Pakington, took up this theme, and after a lengthy debate, in which Lowe (3) declared his strong opposition to the proposals, the amended motion was carried. The Committee, as nominated on 14 March 1865, comprised, "Sir John Pakington, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Walpole, Viscount Enfield, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Clay, Mr. Howes, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Walter, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Stirling, Mr. Buxton, and Mr. Liddell."

---

(1) Ibid., 857.
(2) Ibid., 855.
(3) Ibid., 869-84. Lowe's speech was rather personal, and provoked Pakington into reply. Ibid., 924-6.

Thus Pakington had by the Spring of 1865 achieved those major objectives which he had consistently pursued since the rejection of the Report of the Newcastle Commission and the introduction of the Revised Code. Firstly, that Code was being subjected to careful scrutiny, and to some modification; secondly Lowe had been overthrown and a Vice-President more sympathetic to Pakington's views appointed, and thirdly Pakington had sufficiently demonstrated the weaknesses of the Privy Council system to secure the appointment of a Select Committee, over which he himself would preside, endowed with wide-ranging powers of inquiry. But the very breadth of the inquiry, particularly the breadth added by Walter's amendment, might in the short term prove to be unfortunate. To reconstitute the Education Department was one thing, to solve the issues of rates and conscience was another. Lowe predicted as much on 28 February 1865 when he taxed Pakington with having avoided the rate issue. Pakington, in denying the charge, declared that "He had laid his views with respect to it over and over again before the House, and had avowed it to be his belief - even at the risk of painful differences from those with whom he had acted during a long political life - that a system of rating was the best for the country." (1) That statement was prophetic. Though the Select Committee would find as Pakington wished, though he himself would produce a Draft Report embodying his long-cherished plan for national education, would any government, could any government, Conservative or Liberal, supply the political will necessary for its implementation?

---

(1) Ibid., 924.

Membership of the Select Committee 1865-6, showed a nice political balance overall. In 1865 the Conservatives comprised Pakington, Adderley, Cecil, Walpole, Howes, Liddell and Stirling, (1) and the Liberals Bruce, Forster, Buxton, Clay, Enfield, O'Loghlen, Thompson and Walter. But the election of 1865 saw the defeat of Thompson by Charles Bagnall at Whitby, and also, more seriously, of Walter, who finished only fourth in the Berkshire poll. It would appear that Enfield and Forster declined to serve again, for the Committee as reappointed in 1866 included in their places four new members, three Liberals, Henry Cowper, Shaw-Lefevre and Morrison, and one Conservative, Sir Stafford Northcote. Northcote's appointment as replacement for Walter was to be a crucial one, and on 19 February 1866, the day before the Select Committee was nominated, he made the following significant entry in his diary.

"Pakington asked me to serve on the Education Commission in lieu of Walter, who has lost his seat and names me as the member he would wish to succeed him. I said I was generally with Walter on the question of uncertificated Masters, with Pakington on that of the Constitution of the Office, and against him on the Conscience Clause. Agreed to serve." (2)

During 1865 the Committee met on twenty-two occasions. (3) Pakington and Bruce attended every session, Adderley twenty-one, Walter nineteen, Cecil eighteen, Forster seventeen, and Walpole sixteen. In 1866 there were a

---

(1) Stirling reappeared in 1866 as Sir William Stirling-Maxwell.

(2) Iddesleigh Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 50063A, 70, Northcote's diary, 19 February 1866.

(3) Meetings, usually held on Tuesdays and Fridays, were from 16 March to 23 June 1865, and 23 February to 18 May 1866, with the crucial final deliberations held on 2 and 4 July 1866.

further twenty meetings when Bruce and Adderley with nineteen attendances, Pakington eighteen, Liddell fifteen, and Northcote and Howes fourteen apiece, were the most regular participants. Bruce occupied the chair in Pakington's absence from the meetings of 27 April and 8 May.

Thirty-four witnesses were examined in 1865. Lingen was seen first, and the politicians, Russell, Salisbury, Granville, Adderley, Lowe and Bruce also made early appearances. Kennedy, John Daniel Morell, and Thurtell represented the general inspectorate, Carleton Tufnell that of the pauper schools. The training colleges were represented by Robinson of York and Gover of Saltley. Lonsdale spoke for the National Society and Wilks for the British and Foreign. The attendance of Denison and Temple, though belatedly arranged, needed little justification. Some two-thirds of the witnesses were ordained clergy of the Anglican church, several had fulfilled the role of diocesan inspector. In 1866 a further thirty-three witnesses appeared. Lingen was recalled to explain the workings of the conscience clause, Cumin and Hodgson represented the inquiries of the Newcastle Commission. (1) Bellairs, Binns, Bowstead, Cook and Norris ensured a fuller consideration of the views of the government inspectorate. Some half of the witnesses were called specifically to give evidence upon education in Wales, and this produced both a wider representation of denominational interests than in the evidence of 1865, and the consideration of a range of suggestions for circumventing the religious difficulty. Whilst this evidence was interesting and illuminating, for example Dr. Evan Davies, the penultimate witness,

---

(1) Fraser, another of the Assistant Commissioners, had given evidence in 1865.

spoke of his work as principal of a training college, first at Brecon and then in Swansea, which had had a committee of sixty, including a dozen apiece of Anglicans, Calvinistic Methodists, Baptists, Independents and Wesleyans, the Committee had become bogged down in the details of an issue very far removed from those with which Pakington had been primarily and originally concerned.

In 1865 the Select Committee met regularly throughout May and June, and found little time to prepare a full report. Indeed Temple, one of the most important witnesses, was examined at the very last meeting on 23 June. Pakington's first Draft Report, presented to that meeting, therefore concluded, realistically enough, that whilst sufficient evidence had been collected on the Privy Council system, "The question raised in the second part of the Order of Reference, viz "how best to extend the benefits of Government Inspection and the Parliamentary Grant to schools at present unassisted by the State," is one so wide, and of such extreme importance to the promotion of popular education, that Your Committee think it desirable that further inquiry should be made into branches of this portion of the subject, which they have hitherto touched only incidentally, or not at all." (1) This postponement provided the means of collecting further evidence and also afforded Pakington considerable time to prepare the Draft Report of 1866. Indeed, in that year itself, there was a further passage of time between the eighteenth meeting of the Committee on 18 May, and the final deliberations on 2 and 4 July. Nevertheless, in the

---

(1) P.P. 1865, vi, and P.P. 1866, vii, contain the Reports of the Select Committee. These are referred to hereafter as I and II respectively. Pakington's Draft Report of 1866, hereafter referred to as Draft Report, was P.P. 1866, vii, ix-xvii.

light of the political developments of 1866 it was unfortunate that that section of the Report which related to the Committee of the Privy Council and the Education Minister, did not appear in 1865, particularly as, even on the issue of extension, Pakington seems to have made little specific use of the evidence collected in 1866. In the Draft Report of 1866, in support of his first recommendation, the abolition of the Committee of the Privy Council, there were fifteen references to the evidence of 1865, and on the second point, the establishment of a Minister for Public Instruction of Cabinet rank, a further fourteen. The issue of certificated teachers included thirteen references to the evidence of 1865, and only three to that of 1866. Neglected districts included fifteen references to 1865, and local organization a further eleven. The rate issue contained six references to 1865 and one to 1866. Combination of parishes saw one reference to 1865, endowments two, the conscience clause four. Education in Wales contained three references to the evidence of 1866. Overall therefore Pakington made eighty-one references to the work of the Committee in 1865, and only seven to the evidence of 1866. All bar one of these seven, were confined to the issues of certificated teachers, and education in Wales. There seems little doubt that, had Walter's amendment to Pakington's original proposal not been made, and had Pakington been content to confine himself simply to the constitution of the Committee of the Privy Council and the Education Department, a report on these matters could have been produced in 1865. Such a report, had it been accepted and implemented, might paradoxically have obviated the need for the other part of Pakington's plan, for local education agencies and rates. An efficient, active Ministry of Education might well have filled up the gaps according to its own schemes, which could either have strengthened the voluntary schools or increased centralization and uniformity. Either way the 1870 Act would probably have

been rendered unnecessary. In the event, however, it was not until July 1866 that the Committee addressed itself to Pakington's second, and major, Draft Report.

"46. Your Committee will, in conclusion, recapitulate the conclusions at which they have arrived, and which they believe to be fully supported by the able evidence they have received during two Sessions of Parliament.

"They recommend:

"1. That the Committee of Council on Education, as being no longer adapted to the purpose for which it was formed, should cease to exist.

"2. That there should be a Minister of Public Instruction, with a seat in the Cabinet, who should be entrusted with the care and superintendence of all matters relating to the national encouragement of science and art and popular education in every part of the country.

"3. That although they cannot endanger the supply of competent teachers by proposing abandonment of the teacher's certificate as a condition of assistance to the school, such a modification of that condition should be adopted as would prevent it from being, as it now is, an impediment to the extension of education.

"4. The establishment of local organization in connection with the Education Department, so as to put an end to the present injurious centralization, and enable the superintendence of education to be conducted in a manner similar to that in which the poor law is administered by Boards of guardians under the guidance and control of the Poor Law Board.

"5. That power should be given to levy a rate for the promotion of education in certain cases, to be defined.

"6. That to meet the difficulty caused by small area and population of many parishes, small schools should be combined under a good circulating master, or small parishes combined with a good central school, as the circumstances of the locality might render most expedient.

"7. That the numerous educational endowments now almost useless, should be reformed, and made available.

"8. That the difficulty caused by religious difference should be met by the compulsory adoption of the 'Conscience Clause' in every trust deed, and the Education Minister being empowered to suspend the annual grant to any school on proof of exclusion or undue restraint of non-conformists on religious grounds.

"9. That the impediments to education in Wales, arising from the state of religious opinion in that country, should be met by the adoption, in a liberal spirit, of some plan similar to those suggested in the Evidence and in this Report." (1)

These main recommendations, with which Pakington concluded his Draft Report, constituted but the latest version of that blueprint for educational reform for which he had striven for more than a decade. Were his conclusions, however, as he claimed, "fully supported" by the evidence presented to the Select Committee?

In defence of the first proposal, the abolition of the Committee of Council, Pakington could cite the testimony of Russell that when the system was inaugurated in 1839, "the present extent of its operations was not forseen." Russell's guarded overall judgement, however, was that in the absence of any legislation, "the Committee of Council performs the legislative business relating to Education." (2) Secondly the evidence confirmed that the Committee of Council had no parallel in other departments of state, that is was not analagous to the temporary committees of the Cabinet appointed to deal with particular issues, nor yet comparable with such departments as the Board of Admiralty, whose members were exclusively committed to such work. Russell indeed, for all his interest in education,

---

(1) Draft Report, para 46.
(2) I, 2899. (Arabic numerals refer to the questions and/or answers).

was forced to admit that as Foreign Secretary he had had no time to give to the Committee's business. In the third place the evidence of those most closely connected with the workings of the Committee of Council in recent years, conflicted in respect of its purposes, responsibilities and value. There is no doubt that the Select Committee had done its work thoroughly on this point. Three Lord Presidents, Granville, Salisbury and Russell, (1) three Vice-Presidents, Bruce, Lowe and Adderley, Lingen the Secretary, and some of the inspectors, had all been closely questioned on these issues. But no consensus had emerged. Granville, for example, whilst approving of the Committee, and finding it of great worth, declared that it had "absolutely no responsibility," and, that as Lord President, he would "not be bound by the majority." (2) Russell, however, considered that the Committee had responsibility, and could overrule the Lord President. (3) Salisbury's evidence of practice under the Conservative Government, 1858-9, was even more disturbing; " - Strictly speaking I should have called together the Committee of Council; I did so in three or four instances, I think on important subjects, and the result was that none of them attended, and I therefore acted upon my own responsibility." (4)

Of the Vice-Presidents examined, Bruce cited two instances of valuable contributions by the Committee of Council, one a question of policy, the other a new Minute, whilst Lowe thought the Committee useful for "purely (5)

---

(1) Letters from April and May 1865 show how Pakington firstly persuaded Russell to appear before the Committee, and secondly supplied him with his personal annotated copies of the evidence of Granville, Bruce, Lowe and Adderley, before Russell's own appearance on 12 May. Russell Mss. P.R.O. 30/22/29/212-14, 214a, 215-17, 11 April, 7 May, 9 May 1865.
(2) Draft Report, para 8.
(3) Draft Report, para 9.
(4) I, 1318. In fact, as Salisbury later admitted, one meeting had taken place.
(5) Draft Report, para 6, citing I, 836-8.

legislative purposes," (1) but not for consideration of points of detail. Adderley, however, considered the Committee of Council "useless, and worse than useless". (2) Lingen, who as Secretary since 1849, had witnessed the theory and practice of successive governments, inclined rather towards Granville's view. He saw the Committee as, "a merely consultative body;" (3) the Lord President could, and did, on occasion take education business directly to the Cabinet without any reference to the Committee.

Pakington, after sifting this evidence, reached the conclusion, "that the agency of the Committee of Council, in the ordinary business of the Education Department, whether administrative or legislative, is anomalous and unnecessary; that it tends to diminish, on the part of the Education Minister, that sense of individual responsibility which is the best security for efficient discharge of official duties; and that in those rare cases in which the Minister requires advice from his colleagues, it would be better that the whole Cabinet should be consulted." (4)

Pakington's second conclusion involved two principles, firstly that there should be one single Minister of Public Instruction, rather than two, and secondly, that the post should be of Cabinet rank. In support of the first he adduced evidence as to the uncertainty as to who, if anyone, was responsible for education under the existing system, and the general consensus that there was not enough work to employ the talents of two ministers. Lingen stated that he considered, "the Lord President to be the

---

(1) Draft Report, para 5, citing I, 596. Lowe's answers on the function of the Committee and its powers vis à vis the Lord President were in general accord with those given later by Russell.
(2) Draft Report, para 7, citing I, 963-5.
(3) I, 117.
(4) Draft Report, para 11.

superior officer when he chooses to give an order; but the greater part of the current business of the office is transacted by the Vice-President." (1) He later admitted that he himself had framed the Revised Code under direct instructions from the Vice-President, (2) and agreed with Walpole's suggestion that "the Vice-President, in the absence of the Lord President, would appear to have a co-ordinate authority with the Lord President in all matters of Education." (3) Granville considered both the Lord President and the Vice-President to be responsible ministers, and allowed the Vice-President general discretion in deciding whether to refer a matter to the Lord President, (4) whilst Bruce emphasized the direct responsibility of the Vice-President to the House of Commons. (5) Lowe, however, in spite of his resignation in 1864, argued that the Vice-President was simply an Under-Secretary of State, except in respect of his seat on the Committee of Council. (6) This conflicting evidence, taken in conjunction with the unanimous testimony as to the small amount of time devoted to the work of education by Lord Presidents after 1856, and the proposal for the abolition of the Committee of Council, could well, therefore, justify Pakington's recommendation for a single minister.

The case for a Cabinet minister, however, was more difficult to sustain. Indeed if the role of the Education Department were that assigned to it by the first two witnesses, Lingen and Lowe, then a Cabinet post was not warranted. Lingen simply stated that a statesman of the top rank would not wish to endure the "drudgery" of

---

(1) I, 39.
(2) I, 381-2.
(3) I, 400.
(4) I, 1872, 1897.
(5) I, 827-8.
(6) I, 620-2.

education. (1) Though Pakington and Walter both pressed Lingen hard on this point he would not retract. For him the supervision of the education of the nation was a matter which attracted little prestige or status. "... if you gave that man a choice whether he would be the colonel of a regiment, or a magistrate, or a schoolmaster, there cannot be a doubt that he would choose to be the colonel of a regiment or a magistrate. The actual business of education, whatever it may, some day, be, is not an attractive one, as a matter of fact, to the class of men who rise to the highest offices of the State." (2) Lowe reported that there was insufficient business to occupy a Cabinet minister, "that the duties of the Vice-President even are very light," (3) and that, "I myself have never considered the extension of the education of the country as the duty of this office." (4) Even Bruce and Adderley concurred in the view that a Cabinet minister for education was not essential. The only way, therefore, in which Pakington could justify his second proposal was to link it with a new role for the Education Department. (5)

"Your Committee have come to the conclusion that one of the first requisites in an Education Department is, that it should be suggestive; that it is through the agency of that Department that the public have a right to expect the establishment of an effective system that shall penetrate every part of the country, and that with this view there should be placed at the head of that

---

(1) I, 107.
(2) I, 166.
(3) I, 629.
(4) I, 642.
(5) Russell, for example, considered that this would make a difference to his opinion on the matter of a Minister of Public Instruction. I, 2910-13.

Department a Minister of Public Instruction, whose duty it should be to regulate and control the whole subject of national education, and to propose to Parliament, with the concurrence of the Cabinet, of which he should be a member, such measures as the extension of education might require." (1)

Pakington's third recommendation represented a defeat for the views of John Walter who had campaigned for the abandonment of the requirement that schools in receipt of government grants should be conducted by a certificated teacher. Walter's case, that the system of payment by results obviated the need for insistence upon certification, was supported in 1865 by "a considerable number of witnesses, principally clergymen, from various parts of England." (2) Interestingly two of Pakington's protégés, Reverend William Lea, (3) incumbent of a living near Droitwich and an inspector for the Worcestershire Diocesan Society, and Reverend William Gover, (4) principal of Saltley College, both supported Walter's arguments. But the evidence of Russell, and particularly of Temple, (5) who argued powerfully that the chief object and achievement of the Education Department had been to raise the standards of teaching, and thereby of education generally, carried great weight. (6) In 1866, in the absence of Walter, the majority of witnesses examined on this point supported Temple's opinion that the requirement should not be relaxed.

---

(1) Draft Report, para 21.
(2) Draft Report, para 23.
(3) Examined on 2 May 1865.
(4) Examined on 16 June 1865.
(5) Reverend Frederick Temple D.D. (1821-1902), Headmaster of Kneller Hall, 1850-55, H.M.I., 1856-7, Headmaster of Rugby, 1858-69, and subsequently Archbishop of Canterbury. He gave evidence on 23 June 1865.
(6) Draft Report, para 26.

Pakington, therefore, was forced to conclude that it would be wrong "to recommend that the certificate condition should be altogether given up, and results of examination be adopted as a sole test," (1) although he did propose that further consideration should be given to introducing modifications into the existing system. (2)

Walter and his supporters had no objection to the training and certification of teachers as such, they merely regretted any impediments to "extending the benefits of Government Inspection and the Parliamentary Grants to schools at present unassisted by the State." Pakington's remaining proposals, indeed, were framed to achieve that extension. The sixth, either the combination of small schools under a good circulating master, or combination of parishes to provide one good central school, was recommended for general adoption, to "afford a solution of a difficulty in the case of those numerous parishes which are too small to have a good school in each." (3) The seventh, the reform of educational endowments, he justified by reference to the Report of the Newcastle Commission and to the evidence of Russell and Fraser. (4) Russell indeed had testified that the value of these endowments approximated to £700,000 p.a. (5)

Recommendations four and five were Pakington's scheme for local education authorities empowered to levy rates. (6) He began his argument from the starting point

---

(1) Draft Report, para 28.
(2) Draft Report, para 30 outlined two of the modifications suggested.
(3) Draft Report, para 38. Pakington here made reference to the work of Miss Burdett-Coutts. Reverend Reginald Barnes, Secretary to the Burdett-Coutts ambulatory scheme, gave evidence on 20 June 1865.
(4) Reverend James Fraser, Assistant Commissioner to the Newcastle Commission, and for some years diocesan inspector for Wiltshire.
(5) Draft Report, para 39.
(6) The Poor Law analogy appeared in Recommendation 4.

of the neglected districts, some 11,000 parishes with 6,000,000 inhabitants, as shown by the Report of the Committee of Council for 1863-4, (1) who received no benefit from the annual parliamentary grant. Though there was an increase in the numbers of schools receiving grants, by 271 in 1863, 134 in 1864, 610 in 1865, Pakington was correct in concluding from the evidence that, "statesmen, inspectors, clergymen, heads of colleges, all declare that assistance ought to be extended, and they are almost equally unanimous that the Department, as it now exists, is not able to extend it." (2)

Even Lingen, in reply to Pakington, declared his "very strong opinion" that local agency would greatly add to the efficiency of the existing system, and would also greatly facilitate its extension. (3) He also advised that such local agency "must be accompanied by the power to levy rates." (4) Lingen saw the existing machinery as "essentially provisional",as incapable "ever to become complete and national" and he accordingly concluded, "I am not content with the present system." (5) Lowe, too, declared that the system was not on the right basis, (6) and when pressed by Pakington as to why he had done nothing to remedy it, countered that the Department was not suggestive, it existed only to administer, and that initiative rested with private individuals. Lowe admitted, however, to having considered local organization "in the form which was suggested to us in the Report of the Royal Commissioners, when it was thought that it would be proper

---

(1) Draft Report, para 17.
(2) Draft Report, para 20.
(3) I, 103-4.
(4) I, 423.
(5) I, 429-30.
(6) I, 646.

to form County Boards, and to have a sort of supplementary agency out of the county rate. We decided that the plan was impracticable; we thought that it would be impossible to persuade the House of Commons to agree to it." (1)

Granville and Russell also expressed concern at the insufficiency and overcentralization of the existing system, (2) but the most significant (3) replies proceeded from Bruce. In response to Pakington's criticisms, which centred on the tendency of the system to give grants to the wealthier districts rather than to those most in need, Bruce admitted "that the Education question is unsettled;" that "the system is an imperfect system beyond all doubt;" that grants were "in some cases insufficient, and, in others, not wanted," and that it was "most important" to extend aid to all parts of the country. (4)

Pakington was, indeed, correct in concluding that the evidence in support of a supplementary local system was "nearly unanimous". (5) He refrained, however, from prescribing the best means for achieving that end, contenting himself merely with references to a modified system of existing Diocesan Boards, and to the County Boards proposed by the Newcastle Commission. (6) Similarly, Pakington's cautious fifth recommendation on rating accurately reflected the evidence, for the general tenor

---

(1) I, 641.
(2) Draft Report, para 19, citing I, 1915-19, 2533.
(3) Significant in that as Vice-President and the official Government representative on the Committee, he was yet prepared to admit that fundamental reforms were needed.
(4) Draft Report, para 18, and I, 850-67. Several witnesses also complained of the ungracious manner in which assistance was doled out, of the unintelligible way in which it was frequently withheld, and in particular of the Supplementary Rules, of which they often had no knowledge. On this point see, I, 1988, Reverend William Lea, and I, 4497, Reverend G.H. Fagan.
(5) Draft Report, para 32. See also paras 33-6.
(6) Draft Report, para 36.

of replies on this point was that whilst rating might well be necessary in some cases, it should not be universally compulsory. (1)

No such unanimity could be expected on recommendations eight, which dealt with the Conscience Clause, and nine, the particular religious problem of Wales. In the Principality, as in Ireland, an established Protestant Episcopal Church was supported by a minority of the population, and Pakington urged that solutions be sought "in a spirit of charity and toleration." (2) Two plans were particularly commended, a Church school with a conscience clause and a specified number of Dissenters on the school committee, or a school based on the British and Foreign principle with the parish clergyman as ex-officio chairman.

At first sight Pakington's relentless pursuit of the principle of a compulsory conscience clause throughout the work and Report of the Select Committee, seems to have been unwise. It could not but reveal fundamental differences of opinion between witnesses, and excite in particular the anxieties of Conservative members of the Committee and of the party leadership. (3) Nevertheless it was a principle which Pakington saw as essential to the achievement of national education. If public money were to be directly collected through rates for education then the benefits should be equally available to all, and as a necessary first step Pakington sought the application of a compulsory conscience clause to all schools in receipt of central government aid. He declared his strong

---

(1) Draft Report, para 37, citing I, 422, 671, 1920, 2911, 2536, 5781, and II, 658.
(2) Draft Report, para 45.
(3) On this point see Hughenden Mss. B/XX/Ce/6, Cranborne to Disraeli, 29 June 1866, and B/XX/P/78, Pakington to Disraeli, 1 July 1866.

disapproval of the existing conscience clause on two grounds; "1. It has never been submitted for Parliamentary sanction. 2. It is not enforced on any clear and distinct principle, but is required to be inserted in a trust deed or not at the arbitrary discretion of the Education Office." (1)

Pakington's deliberate attempts to lead witnesses on this issue produced some of the liveliest exchanges. Russell, for example, when asked whether he was aware that several Bishops approved of the conscience clause, drily retorted, "Yes: but I have heard it very much opposed, and in the county of Worcester, with which the Right Honourable Baronet must be acquainted, there has been a decision against it." (2) Pakington found some supporters. Edward Wilks, (3) Secretary to the British and Foreign School Society, for example, naturally approved of the principle, whilst the Reverend John G. Lonsdale, (4) Secretary to the National Society, admitted that the Society's rules were relaxed according to the opinions of individual clergy. But two doughty champions of the principle of exclusion appeared in the lists. Reverend G.H. Fagan, Secretary to the Diocesan Education Society of Bath and Wells, declared strong opposition to the conscience clause, whilst on 19 May 1865 Archdeacon Denison, who had specifically asked Pakington for leave to give evidence on this point appeared before the

---

(1) Draft Report, para 41.
(2) I, 2939. Russell doubtless knew that Pakington himself had moved the resolution to which he referred. Pakington was defeated by 49 votes to 16, but though Lyttelton had opposed him the Bishop of Worcester had spoken and voted in his support. There is a long report of this five hour meeting of the Worcester Archidiaconal Board, held on 17 January 1865, in The Times, 19 January 1865.
(3) I, 3544.
(4) I, 1843.

Committee. Pakington probably relished this encounter with his old adversary. By skilful questioning he forced Denison to admit that the Conscience Clause had had many beneficial effects, that Church doctrines and opinions had been extended thereby, and that Denison himself could instance no cases of bad results. (1) But the implacable determination of the exclusionists, even in the face of reason and logic, was also revealed.

"3695 ... My rule, which I observe strictly, and always shall observe, with regard to all schools in my hands is, that I do not admit any child to a school unless that child has been baptized in the Church of England ... .

"3697 Do I understand you to state that you have no objection to admit into your school the child of any Dissenter, provided that child has been baptized? - That is all.

"3698 But when the child is there do you make it a condition that the terms of union of the National Society shall be adhered to, and that the child shall learn the whole catechism, and shall attend your church on Sundays ? - Yes ... .

"3700 Did I rightly understand you to say that there are some Dissenters in your parish whose children do not attend school? - That may be the case but I really cannot answer the question ... ." (2)

Denison argued throughout that his responsibility was the education of children in the doctrines of the Church. What, Pakington asked, of the Dissenting child in a parish with only one Church school?

"3757 My question is whether or not you should shut the door in that child's face? - I should.

"3896 ... My conscience tells me, that if I am to have anything to do with the child, it must be on my own terms, and I cannot take him on any other terms." (3)

---

(1) I, 3733-5.
(2) I, 3695, 3697, 3698, 3700.
(3) I, 3757, 3896.

Overall the majority of witnesses gave guarded approval to the Conscience Clause principle, (1) but Pakington was posing alternatives which many would seek to avoid, in declaring that it should either be "adopted as essential to the extension of education with justice to the people, or abandoned as inconsistent with the duties of the National Church." (2)

Though many sections of Pakington's Report were controversial, - rate-aided education, for example, as Lowe had intimated in 1865, was still a highly contentious issue - recommendation eight on the conscience clause posed the most serious immediate problem for the Conservative party. Moreover, the announcement on 26 June of the resignation of Russell's government meant that at least four members of the Committee would probably sign the Report as Ministers in a new Conservative Cabinet. Cranborne accordingly wrote urgently to Disraeli, "... he makes stronger propositions in the Conscience Clause direction than <u>any one</u> has yet made. Now if he is to be a Cabinet Minister in your incoming Administration, this is a very serious matter ... If Pakington takes office with you he ought to be strongly urged to modify or abandon this Report." (3) Pakington made some attempt to defend his course of action. He saw Derby on 1 July, and then wrote to Disraeli, "... there is nothing new in the "Conscience Clause" being supported by the Conservative Party - Lord Derby himself advocated the principle in a speech at Liverpool - I, as you well know, have supported it for years. Adderley pressed it officially from the Education Office when V.P. . 4-5ths of the clergy <u>act</u> upon the principle, though they do not like it as law. Several of the Bishops now approve of the clause.

---

(1) <u>Draft Report</u>, para 42.
(2) <u>Draft Report</u>, para 43.
(3) <u>Hughenden Mss</u>. B/XX/Ce/6, Cranborne to Disraeli, 29 June 1866.

It seems to me therefore that it may be fairly considered, as it has in fact, long been, an open question. I will take any conciliatory course that I consistently can, but I am sure that you would not wish me to do more." (1) Pakington's resistance soon crumbled, and later in the year he gave this summary of the effects of the resignation of the Liberal Government. "... the result was that it became a matter of absolute impossibility, from the extent of the time at our disposal, for the report to be fully considered by the committee. The consequence was that by the unanimous consent of the committee - for not only was I myself concerned in the formation of the new Government, but three other members of the committee are now colleagues of mine in office - a brief report was drawn, simply stating that, from the circumstances of the moment, it was impossible for them to consider that elaborate report which I had prepared. And, therefore that report appears among the papers as only my report, and consequently can be considered as expressing the opinions simply of the man who wrote it." (2)

It was Northcote (3) who drew up the "brief report" which on 4 July 1866 the Select Committee adopted in place of Pakington's own. It concluded, "Under these circumstances, though with great regret, your Committee have come to the

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/78, Pakington to Disraeli, 1 July 1866.

(2) Pakington's speech to the fifteenth annual dinner of the Church of England United Association of Schoolmasters of South Staffordshire and North Worcestershire, as reported in The Times, 8 October 1866.

(3) He wrote to Disraeli informing him that Pakington would accept a compromise. Iddesleigh Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 50015, 146-7, Copy of Northcote to Disraeli, 3 July 1866. Northcote had taken a full part in the Committee's proceedings, and had tried unsuccessfully at the meeting of 23 February to direct the Committee's attention to the plight of children whose parents were too poor to pay for their education.

conclusion that they cannot, for want of time, enter with advantage upon the discussion of the important Draft Report presented to them by their Chairman, and have resolved to lay the Evidence alone upon the Table of your Honourable House; leaving it for your Honourable House to determine whether they shall be re-appointed next year, in order to prepare a Report thereon." (1)

The Committee was not re-appointed and this episode can thus also be catalogued amongst Pakington's many disappointments and defeats. But the work of the Select Committee, the evidence collected, the Draft Report itself, which inasmuch as it had been formally proposed was printed in the proceedings, could not merely be discounted, as if they had never been. Bruce had played a leading part in the Committee's deliberations, he had been the most regular in attendance, missing only one meeting, and even Northcote's report noted the particular nature of his commitment. "During the whole of their inquiry they have had the advantage of the presence and assistance of the Vice-President of the Committee on Education, who has represented the views of the Government of which he was a Member." (2) Forster, too, had been in regular attendance during the meetings of 1865. Russell, Granville, Lowe and Lingen had all been forced to admit the deficiencies of the existing system. The Select Committee of 1865-6, far from being a total failure, was an essential, and hitherto largely-neglected catalyst which stimulated, on the Conservative side, Corry's scheme of December 1866 and Marlborough's Bill of 1868, and amongst the Liberals, the Education of the Poor Bill of 1867, sponsored by two members of the Committee, Bruce and Forster, Russell's resolution of 1867 for the appointment of a Minister of Public Instruction, and ultimately, the 1870 Act itself.

---

(1) P.P. 1866, vii, xvii.
(2) Ibid.

Chapter Eight

EDUCATION AND THE STATE, 1866-1870

In Derby's third government Pakington returned to the Admiralty, and was soon busily at odds with Disraeli over the issue of naval expenditure. Indeed for the next two years, originally as First Lord, and from 1867 as Secretary for War, though he spoke in the Commons on some four hundred occasions, Pakington was almost totally silent on the education issue. The Select Committee was not revived, even though, or perhaps because, four of its members, as Cranborne had predicted, were members of Derby's Cabinet. (1) It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Pakington, involved as he was with such emotive matters as dockyard corruption, courts martial, commission purchase and flogging, has been ignored and misinterpreted by some writers on Conservative education policy in the years 1866-8. Thus Anthony Bishop and Wilfred Jones in an article (2) on the Conservative Education Bill of 1868 fail even to mention Pakington's name, whilst Henry Roper, writing of the years 1865-8, concludes that, "Pakington's emphasis fell upon rural rather than urban conditions; he had little sense of an uneducated proletariat which needed to be compelled to be educated for the good of society," (3) as if the Bills of 1855 and 1857 had never been! And yet it was Pakington's work for the cause

---

(1) Pakington himself, Cranborne (India), Northcote (Board of Trade) and Walpole (Home Secretary). Stanley was at the Foreign Office.

(2) Anthony Bishop and Wilfred Jones, 'The Act that never was: the Conservative Education Bill of 1868', History of Education, I (2), 1972.

(3) Henry Roper, 'Toward an Elementary Education Act for England and Wales, 1865-1868', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXIII (2), 1975, 187.

of national education in the years prior to 1866 which was now to shape the attitudes and policies of Conservatives and Liberals alike, and to lead eventually to the Education Act of 1870. This is not to overturn the basic story of politics, pressure groups and statistics in these years which has been recounted in detail elsewhere, (1) nor is it to deny that current investigations of the extent of education immediately prior to the 1870 Act, and of the motives, intentions and contributions of those who sought educational legislation at this time are not of great importance. (2) Nevertheless, it is essential to understand that the Select Committee of 1865-6 was a turning point in the educational thinking of many of those who took part in its proceedings, whether as members or witnesses, that Pakington's Draft Report was the widely-recognized blueprint for reform, and that his Bill of 1857 was acknowledged by Bruce and Forster as the model upon which Liberal legislation was to be based.

Pakington had not expected his Draft Report to secure total approval by the Select Committee. As he himself commented, "Most probably some portions would have been adopted, while others would have been rejected." (3) He also foresaw that reform of Parliament would "afford a very great stimulus for education" so that "... the next time I or any other Member introduced into this House a proposal for the extension of education, we should find

---

(1) R.E. Aldrich, 'Education and the Political Parties, 1830-1870', London University M.Phil thesis, 1970, 331-72.

(2) See, for example, W.P. McCann, 'Elementary Education in England and Wales on the Eve of the 1870 Education Act', Journal of Educational Administration and History, II (1), 1969, and E.G. West, Education and the Industrial Revolution (1975), 104-6.

(3) Hansard, CLXXXIV, 1358-9, 23 July 1866.

much greater zeal employed in its support than we have hitherto witnessed." (1) Pakington thus supported the Reform Bill of 1867, though he played no major part in its progress through the Commons, and in 1868 concluded that the education cause "had received a very important stimulus by the great extension of the franchise which was agreed to during the last Session of Parliament." (2) Pakington's reticence on the Representation of the People Bill was probably occasioned in part by his embarrassment over the "Ten Minute" revelation, and also by his fear that extreme democracy would lead to republicanism. (3) Pakington's statements on the significance of franchise reform for education were in the nature of propaganda, Lowe's more famous epigram was an attempt to justify the abandonment of his stance on national education which had now become as untenable as his position on parliamentary reform. Rather than admit defeat on both issues it was easier for Lowe to suggest that one good turn necessitated another. Lowe was one of the last of the leading Liberal politicians to recognize the necessity for an education act, and it is difficult to accept D.W. Sylvester's judgement "that Lowe earlier, and more publicly, than any other politician, suggested the lines of development upon which a new system was eventually built." (4)

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXXIII, 1496, 30 May 1866.
(2) The Times, 7 January 1868, reporting an address by Pakington to the Droitwich Mechanics' Institute.
(3) R.B. Osborne, when taking Pakington to task for his reticence on Parliamentary Reform in the Commons, declared that "instead of our cry being "Register, register," henceforth it will be "Education, education"." Hansard, CLXXXVIII, 1585, 15 July 1867.
(4) D.W. Sylvester, 'Robert Lowe and the 1870 Education Act', History of Education, III (2), 1974, 17. A.J. Marcham, 'Educating our Masters: Political Parties and Elementary Education 1867-1870', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (2), 1973, minimizes the influence of Lowe. See also A.J. Marcham, 'The 'Myth' of Benthamism, The Second Reform Act, and the Extension of Popular Education', Journal of Educational Administration and History, II (2), 1970, which questions the extent of the influence of Parliamentary Reform upon the 1870 Act.

Rather was the Draft Report of 1866 the impetus for change. By 1867 Pakington's proposals had been taken up within Parliament. (1) Thus though most Conservatives would not accept Nos. 4, 5, 8 and 9, (2) that is to say, rating and the conscience clause, Henry Corry had before the end of 1866 presented proposals to the Cabinet to implement recommendations 3 and 6, on the extension of the grant to neglected districts. Moreover, though there was much heart searching over the issue of a Minister of Public Instruction, (3) (Nos. 1 and 2), by 1868 this too, together with a new conscience clause, were two elements in an official Conservative Education Bill. In 1867 Russell, from the Liberal side, proposed in the Lords the establishment of a Minister of Education with a seat in the Cabinet, and the reform of educational endowments (No. 7), and on that occasion had also declared himself to be a supporter of Pakington's statements on the conscience clause (Nos. 8 and 9). But the most complete acceptance of Pakington's Draft Report came from Bruce and Forster. Though doubtful on the issue of a Minister of Education and the complete abolition of the Committee of Council, they supported all the other proposals. Bruce and Forster now adopted the principles of local organization, rates and conscience clause, and in 1867 they specifically modelled their Education of the Poor Bill upon Pakington's measure of ten years earlier. This in itself is not

---

(1) In principle, though there were no specific proposals for education in Wales.
(2) These numbers refer to the 9 recommendations with which Pakington concluded his Draft Report. They are listed in full on pp. 241-2.
(3) The terms 'Minister of Public Instruction' and 'Minister of Education' appear to have been used equally at this time.

surprising for Bruce and Forster, as Pakington had done in 1857, were in a sense acting as agents for the Manchester educationists. But though the Bills of 1867 and 1868 were as unsuccessful as those of the previous decade, whereas Pakington with no political base from which to work on this matter had been unable to follow up his defeat, save by appealing to a wider consensus through the findings of a Royal Commission the situation had now significantly altered. For Bruce and Forster, particularly should Gladstone and Lowe be persuaded to change their minds on this issue, might, as members of the next Liberal administration, be expected to produce a government bill. Pakington himself had long been convinced that such was the best, indeed perhaps the only, means of securing a genuine national education. "He had repeatedly said that we should never solve the great problem of national education until we had arrived at the fulfilment of two conditions - the one the existence of a strong Government, the other the existence of a Government which was not only strong but determined to settle the question. The first of these conditions was realized, and he was well aware that his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department, as well as the Vice-President of the Committee of Council had long had the subject sincerely at heart." (1) Pakington therefore saw the 1870 Act as the culmination and fulfilment of "almost every one of those provisionsfor which humbly but earnestly, I have laboured for the last 15 or 20 years." (2) He acknowledged Forster's achievement on that occasion, and it is pleasant to record that Forster in the years 1867-70 frequently acknowledged himself to be Pakington's disciple. Thus

---

(1) Hansard, CXCIV, 1248, 12 March 1869.
(2) Hansard, CCIII, 755, 22 July 1870.

Forster admitted both in 1868 and 1870 that the Bills of 1867 and 1868 were based upon Pakington's measure of 1857. He also, on the second reading of the 1870 Bill declared that it was Pakington, "from whom I have learnt much respecting education," (1) who had for so long pointed the true way to progress in education, whilst at the conclusion of the third reading when Forster thanked the House in general for its support of the Bill, he declared "I chiefly rose to express my thanks to the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir John Pakington) ... ." (2)

In the autumn of 1866 Henry Corry, (3) the Conservative Vice-President, addressed himself to Pakington's Draft Report. Two recommendations, Nos. 3 and 6, appeared to be most appropriate for early action; firstly to take steps to increase the numbers of certificated teachers and pupil teachers, to prevent the certificated teacher requirement from being "an impediment to the extension of education," (4) and secondly to find means of bringing government financial aid "to meet the difficulty caused by small area and population of many parishes." (5) Corry's proposals were presented to the Cabinet in December 1866, and to the Commons in February 1867. He wisely urged them on Disraeli as essential if the Conservative Government were not to "leave it to our political opponents to get

---

(1) Hansard, CXCIX, 1949, 14 March 1870. Earlier in this speech, ibid., 1944, Forster had referred to the example of religious toleration practised at King Edward's Birmingham, yet another link with Pakington's work of the 1850's.
(2) Hansard, CCIII, 758, 22 July 1870.
(3) M.P. for Tyrone, whose earlier ministerial experience had been at the Admiralty. Adderley had originally been destined for the Vice-Presidency, but became instead Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office. Buckingham was the Lord President.
(4) Draft Report, para 46, recommendation 3.
(5) Draft Report, para 46, recommendation 6.

the credit with the Country which is within our reach." (1) There can be little doubt that had the Liberals continued in office in 1866 a similar first step would have been taken in this genuine effort to 'fill up the gaps', and thus to secure the second objective of the Select Committee of 1865-6, namely "the best mode of extending the benefits of Government Inspection and the Parliamentary Grant to Schools at present unassisted by the State." Bruce indeed, on 28 February 1867 in the debate on the new Minute, having given a masterly and objective summary of the Revised Code and of its consequences, deplored its effects on the salaries of teachers, and the supply of pupil teachers, and regretted its tendency to aggravate "one of the evils most strongly urged against our system - namely, that it gave aid where it was least wanted, and withheld it where the need was sorest." (2) Bruce disclosed that Granville and he had in 1866, shortly before leaving office, "determined to propose for the consideration of the Government a plan somewhat similar to that which the right hon. Gentleman had just submitted to the House." (3) Lowe, however, spoke strongly against the changes. He argued against "tinkering and pulling to pieces the system which had produced such results," (4) he welcomed the fall in pupil-teacher numbers, and opposed the £70,000 increase (5) which the new Minute would require. On 5 April (6) he moved a resolution against the proposed increase in grant of £70,000, but was defeated by 203 votes to 40. Bruce on that occasion also spoke in support of Corry and against Lowe.

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XXI/C/441, Corry to Disraeli, 24 December 1866.
(2) Hansard, CLXXXV, 1158-9, 28 February 1867.
(3) Ibid., 1159.
(4) Ibid., 1162.
(5) Corry estimated that some £60 - 70,000 p.a. would be the additional grant required when the new schemes were fully operational.
(6) Hansard, CLXXXVI, 1176, 5 April 1867.

The most significant feature of the debate of 28 February 1867, however, was that it showed the extent to which Bruce, Corry, Lowe and other members of the House, were influenced in their arguments by the findings of the Select Committee. Thus Bruce referred to Pakington's change of opinion over the issue of certificated masters, and advised that "a similar change took place in the opinion of at least one other member of the Committee. At the same time, there was a concurrence equally general that there were certain portions of the Revised Code which were susceptible of improvement, by which, without infringing any principle of that Code, greater encouragement might be given to schools in the poorer districts both of country and town." (1) Lowe, in the light of evidence given to the Select Committee, was forced to concede that "The system is not defensible upon abstract principles, and the only way to defend and maintain it is by making it so economical and so effective that practical men may hesitate to sweep it away." (2)

Corry, whose proposals were aimed at increasing the numbers of pupil teachers, and the size of grants to schools, argued that "Justice and policy alike required that small and poor schools should share in the contributions by the State towards the education of the poor." (3) He quoted from the reports of inspectors, including Watkins, and announced that the details of his proposals had been formulated after consultation with H.M.I. Moncrieff. But possibly the most striking argument which Corry presented in support of the new Minute was his

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXXV, 1158, 28 February 1867.
(2) Ibid., 1163.
(3) Ibid., 1148.

simple quotation of Tufnell's evidence to the Select Committee in 1865. (1) "There is one part of the Revised Code which is doing an injury to the country which it is impossible to lament too seriously. I allude to the discouragement which is thrown upon the engagement of pupil-teachers. The whole pupil-teacher system is now in danger of being upset." (2)

The new Minute was a small but promising first step. It had successfully challenged the semi-sacrosanct nature of the Revised Code, had secured the support of members from both sides of the House, and had increased the discomfiture and isolation of Lowe. But in March 1867 Lord Robert Montagu succeeded Corry as Vice-President and immediately destroyed his credibility with the majority of the party in general, and with Disraeli in particular, by declaring himself "decidedly in favour of secular education being given to all who came for it in schools which received a subsidy from Her Majesty's Government." (3) Montagu's statement on this occasion was entirely consistent with the eighth proposal of Pakington's Draft Report for the suspending of "the annual grant to any school on proof of exclusion or undue restraint of non-conformists on religious grounds." (4)

But Disraeli remonstrated with the new Vice-President and showed his displeasure by putting up others to deal with educational matters in the Commons. Montagu for

---

(1) Tufnell's reply to Question 1,160. Corry's approach at this point was in marked contrast to that of Lowe who, as Vice-President, had felt himself unable to trust his inspectors.
(2) Hansard, CLXXXV, 1154, 28 February 1867.
(3) Quoted in P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 82. Marlborough succeeded Buckingham as Lord President in March 1867. In the Cabinet reshuffle which followed the Reform resignations, Corry succeeded Pakington, who in turn replaced Peel at the War Office, whilst Buckingham became Colonial Secretary instead of Carnarvon.
(4) Draft Report, para 46, recommendation 8.

his part attempted to restore himself to favour by adopting an ultra-Conservative approach. He declared that the apathy of parents was the main cause of educational deficiencies, (1) and that "in some parishes they could never expect to see good schools established ... for it was contrary to the nature of things." (2) Marlborough, the new Lord President, was in 1867 as concerned as Montagu to show that the Government intended to stand by the existing system. In so doing he was at pains to dissociate himself and the administration from the other recommendations in Pakington's Draft Report. Thus when on 5 July 1867 the Liberal Earl of Cork asked for the extension of government grants to all schools in need, and, having referred to the evidence of several witnesses to the Select Committee, quoted from Pakington's Draft Report and "owned that he relied to some extent upon this partial admission, coming from such a quarter, that one at least of the conditions exacted by the Privy Council operated as an impediment to the extension of education," (3) Marlborough replied that "the Report in question had never been adopted by the Committee. It was submitted to them as the draft Report prepared by the Chairman, and must be taken for the individual opinion of that Gentleman and nothing more." (4)

But though the Conservative Government, much occupied with the intricacies of a Reform Bill which had already caused serious Cabinet divisions, had no further immediate plans for educational measures, 1867 saw the introduction into the Commons of an Education Bill which its sponsors acknowledged was based upon Pakington's work. Bruce had been struck by the findings of the Manchester and Salford

---

(1) Hansard, CLXXXVIII, 338, 21 June 1867.
(2) Hansard, CLXXXIX, 380, 29 July 1867.
(3) Hansard, CLXXXVIII, 1046, 5 July 1867.
(4) Ibid., 1054-5.

Education Aid Society as to the extent of educational deprivation in that area, "the thunderclap from Manchester,"[1] and he, Forster and Algernon Egerton, Conservative M.P. for South Lancashire who advocated rating and a conscience clause, determined to introduce "A Bill to provide for the Education of the Poorer Classes in England and Wales". The second reading of the Bill was not reached until 10 July [2] and there was no possibility of its becoming law, but Bruce in particular used the session to show his own belief that the solution to the problem of educational deprivation in urban areas, a problem which he now admitted, was a system of rate-aided schooling, accompanied by a conscience clause. [3]

On 6 June Montagu, in reply to questions from T.D. Acland, Liberal M.P. for Devon North, advised that the Government did not insist on the insertion of a conscience clause when applications were made for building grants. [4] Bruce, however, was now fully in support of the eighth recommendation of Pakington's Draft Report for the compulsory adoption of the clause in every trust deed. He believed that on this issue the clergy would now accept from Parliament terms, which if consulted they would attempt to refuse, and he concluded that "the time had come when a final solution of this irritating controversy might, in his opinion, be effectually applied." [5] Bruce, indeed, on several occasions during the debates of 1867, and on a variety of issues, made reference to the Select Committee and to the Draft Report. One of the clearest statements of his identification with

---

(1) Quoted in S.E. Maltby, Manchester and the Movement for National Elementary Education 1800-1870 (1918), 100.
(2) Hansard, CLXXXVII, 1317, 10 July 1867. Though the formal first reading had taken place on 5 April.
(3) Conservative attitudes to the Conscience Clause in 1866-7 are described in P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 81-2.
(4) Hansard, CLXXXVII, 1659, 5 June 1867.
(5) Hansard, CLXXXV, 1160, 28 February 1867.

Pakington on the conscience clause occurred on 3 May in the debate which followed a question on national education from J.G. Hubbard. Hubbard, Conservative M.P. for Buckingham, a supporter of the existing denominational system, and an opponent of rating and conscience clause, sought and received on that occasion Montagu's assurance that the existing system would not be upset. (1) But Bruce presented the opposite view, and declared that "He most cordially agreed, therefore, with the Report which had been presented by his right hon. Friend (Sir John Pakington), who had proposed that in all cases where grants were made from the public money the Conscience Clause should be thoroughly enforced." (2) Similarly on 5 April, on the issue of rating Bruce justified his own position by reference to Pakington's Bills of the 1850's. (3)

Eventually, on 10 July, when the second reading of the Education of the Poor Bill was moved, Bruce again made frequent reference to Pakington's work. (4) He singled out the Bill of 1855 for special mention, he referred to Pakington's role in establishing the Newcastle Commission and to the findings of that body. But he relied particularly upon the "latest inquiry on this subject", the Select Committee of 1865-6. He quoted in full the important paragraph 37 of Pakington's Draft Report which concluded "that an education rate ought to

---

(1) For Hubbard's views see his speech Hansard, CLXXXVI, 1995-2000, 3 May 1867, and The Conscience Clause in 1866. Speeches delivered in the Chapter House of York Minster, on the 13th of October, 1866, by John Gellibrand Hubbard, M.P., and the Reverend George Trevor, Canon of York (1866).
(2) Hansard, CLXXXVI, 2012, 3 May 1867.
(3) Hansard, CLXXXVI, 1193, 5 April 1867. Bruce's speech was made in the debate on Lowe's resolution on the Education grants. There was no debate on the first reading of the Education of the Poor Bill which also took place on this date.
(4) Hansard, CLXXXVIII, 1317-42, 10 July 1867.

form part of any scheme for extended assistance." Bruce concluded by asking the Government either to accept the Bill, or to undertake during the recess to frame a measure of their own which would produce similar results. If they declined to take either of these courses, "an announcement which he should be very much astonished to hear from any member of an administration of which Sir John Pakington and Lord Stanley formed a part," (1) he would press the House to a division. Egerton seconded the Bill in a short speech, (2) and then, fittingly, it was Henley, (3) who had led the opposition to Pakington's proposals of the 1850's, who spoke strongly against a Bill which he argued, "if not so intended, would, nevertheless, most certainly break up all the existing voluntary and denominational systems in the country." (4) When Forster (5) sought to allay the fears which Henley had raised, Gathorne Hardy, (6) the Home Secretary, gave the official Government view. He deplored the attempt by Bruce to force this matter on a Government of such short standing whilst Liberal administrations since 1859 had produced no such proposals. Hardy declared that "He was not prepared himself, nor was he aware that any of his Colleagues were prepared, to support the second reading of the Bill at present." (7) Pakington was silent on this occasion, but an important speech by Gladstone showed that one of his principal political opponents had been converted to his views. For Gladstone now advised the House that though

---

(1) Ibid., 1341.
(2) Ibid., 1342-4.
(3) Ibid., 1343-50.
(4) Ibid., 1345.
(5) Ibid., 1350-6.
(6) Ibid., 1356-61. Member for Oxford University and Home Secretary from May 1867. Walpole whom he replaced remained in the Cabinet without portfolio. Montagu would appear to have been 'frozen out' on 10 July.
(7) Ibid., 1360.

when the Report of the Newcastle Commission was presented the Liberal Cabinet "could not bring themselves to sanction, as the basis of legislative enactment, the recommendations it contained," the matter was now "in an entirely different position." Gladstone now produced figures to show the gaps in the existing educational system, declaring that he would give "warmest support" to an education bill from the Government, and admitting "that the conscience clause afforded the last chance of a permanent system of denominational education." (1) The debate was adjourned, and the Bill withdrawn some five days later. The Bill of 1867 has been examined in some detail by Henry Roper who characterizes it as "in many respects the direct ancestor of the 1870 Act." (2) Forster in 1870, with a fuller sense of history, whilst the House was in Committee on the Education Bill of that year, referred back not only to the Bill of 1867 but "to the Bill of the right hon. Member for Droitwich (Sir John Pakington), a Bill which was the parent of the measure introduced by myself and the Home Secretary. That Bill gave rate aid to every denominational school willing to accept the Conscience Clause; we adopted that principle, but did not make it compulsory." (3)

Problems of education were considered by Conservative leaders during the recess. Disraeli in two speeches at Edinburgh (4) in the autumn of 1867 proclaimed both the

---

(1) Ibid., 1361-5.
(2) Henry Roper, 'Toward an Elementary Education Act for England and Wales, 1865-1868', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXIII (2), 1975, 191.
(3) Hansard, CCII, 591, 20 June 1870. The Bill of 1857.
(4) W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1929), II, 461. See also P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 105-12, which contains a good summary of Conservative attitudes to education 1867-8.

importance of education and the determination of the Government to tackle the issue in the coming session. The production of a specific bill, however, raised considerable difficulties. A measure of some boldness would be needed to seize the initiative from the Liberals, and yet the maintenance of the existing school system, and of Anglican predominance, together with frequent and recently expressed abhorrence of both rating and the universal conscience clause, by Conservatives in politics and the Church, rendered legislation of that nature virtually impossible.

In their search for a solution the party turned back to Pakington's recommendations. A confidential eighteen page memorandum was prepared by the Vice-President on the 'Privy Council, Committee of Education, Constitution of Office' in October 1867. (1) It began with an appraisal of the Report of the Newcastle Commission, and then passed to Pakington's Draft Report. Montagu accepted the condemnatory nature of the evidence to the Select Committee, and concluded that "the safest course is to follow the finding of the Right Honourable Chairman." (2) He therefore proposed "that the Committee of Council on Education should become the Committee of Council on Education and Charities," and that "it may be proposed to establish a permanent Board or Council of Education to act under and subject to the complete control of the Lord President." (3) The memorandum, however, stopped

---

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/54. See also A.S. Bishop, The Rise of a Central Authority for English Education (1971), 222-4.
(2) P.R.O. Ed. 24/54/7.
(3) P.R.O. Ed. 24/54/10. This is a confusing document. The Board or Council here proposed would not completely replace the Committee of Council on Education, and the original purpose (ibid., 12) of such a Board was to prepare the Bill necessitated by the transformation of the Committee of Council on Education into the Committee of Council on Education and Charities. The Charity Commission would become a department of the Privy Council.

short of Pakington's recommendations of the complete abolition of the Committee of Council, and of the institution of a Minister of Public Instruction. Similarly, a second and fuller memorandum (1) of sixty-six pages, prepared on Marlborough's direction, entitled 'Memorandum relative to the Business of the Privy Council Office', recognized some of the problems which existed in the administration of education but failed to suggest any basic solutions. It advised "At the same time, it might not perhaps be inexpedient, if the Committee of Council on Education be continued at all, to compose it, by Act of Parliament, of the heads ex officio of all those Departments which include inspection or Schools in their estimates, such as the Admiralty, War Office, Home Office, and Poor Law Board." (2)

The Board, as proposed under Montagu's scheme of October 1867 would have consisted of the three Charity Commissioners, Lingen, Henry Cole who would have taken charge of the Science and Art Department and technical education, and, initially, the Vice-President himself. Montagu now invited Cole to furnish in writing his opinions on the state of education. Cole's submission was intended as a few suggestions, rather than "any new or comprehensive plan". (3) Yet, since it included the abandonment of the certificated teacher requirement, the provision of a bill for permissive local rating, and the establishment of a Minister of Public Instruction, not the Lord President, who should rank as a Secretary of State with a seat in the

---

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/55, 18 November 1867.
(2) P.R.O. Ed. 24/55/6.
(3) Sir H. Cole, Fifty Years of Public Work (2 vols., 1884), I, 348-50, gives a good summary of Cole's position, and includes a long extract from this document of 27 November 1867. In the 1860's Cole and Pakington had discussions on the plan for a National Training School for Music, I, 369-71.

Cabinet, it clearly raised problems for the Government in general, and for Marlborough in particular.

On 2 December 1867, however, in the new session of Parliament, Russell seized the educational initiative by proposing four resolutions. These included, the duty of the state to maintain every child's right to education, the improved administration of educational endowments, the removal of restrictions at Oxford and Cambridge, and the appointment of a Minister of Education with a seat in the Cabinet. (1) Russell's first resolution included the statement that "Diffusion of Knowledge ought not to be hindered by Religious Differences." Half of his speech was devoted to this issue, and in particular to the opinions of Pakington on the conscience clause. He praised Pakington himself, "... who has always been a great friend of education, who has never concealed his opinions on the subject, and who has manfully, and in a most straightforward manner, on all occasions defended and proposed the most liberal measures with regard to education." (2) He also praised "the draft Report which in itself deals with the subject in a very able and exhaustive manner," and quoted fully from its conclusions. He therefore advised the House that secular education was the only alternative to the universal conscience clause, and, as President of the British and Foreign School Society, declared his opposition to Denison and his support for simple Bible teaching; "I should say the Conscience Clause ought to be adopted, and I go the whole length of the assertion made by Sir John Pakington upon this subject ... I have always been of the same opinion with Sir John Pakington." (3) Marlborough, (4) in reply, sought not to acknowledge Pakington's recommendations but rather

---

(1) Hansard, CXC, 478-93, 2 December 1867.
(2) Ibid., 485-6.
(3) Ibid., 489.
(4) Ibid., 493-506.

to decry them. He reminded the Lords that Russell had praised "not the Report of the Committee, but a draft Report prepared by the Chairman but not adopted by the Committee." He also questioned the statistics which Pakington had quoted in the Report to show the extent of unaided parishes. (1) Marlborough advised that although the Committee of Council Report of 1863-4, which Pakington had cited, referred to 11,024 unaided parishes, these were Poor Law parishes, and the number of unaided school parishes was only 8,866. (2) Marlborough conceded that some improvements were required in relation to the poorest class of urban children, and hinted at some relaxation of the certificated teacher requirement, but he also declared his "very great objections to the appointment of a Minister of Education." (3)

Though Russell's resolutions were defeated the Cabinet remained uncertain and divided on the education issue, with Disraeli, as ever, thinking principally in terms of party advantage. In January 1868 Pakington and Stanley made speeches which showed their commitment to the principles of 1857. Pakington, at Droitwich, declared that "the main impediment to the extension of popular education had been the religious differences which had unfortunately prevailed amongst them. If any wide and general system were to be adopted it must be founded on religious toleration and forbearance in consideration of the views of others." (4) He went on to refer to "a growing disposition" among persons in the highest positions

---

(1) Draft Report, para 17.
(2) Figures for 1866; 10,404 Poor Law parishes, and 8,368 unaided school parishes.
(3) Hansard, CXC, 505, 2 December 1867.
(4) The Times, 7 January 1868, a report of Pakington's address to the Droitwich Mechanics' Institute.

in Church and State to make concessions on the conscience clause. (1) More important, however, was Stanley's speech at Bristol, where the city's Conservative Association provided a banquet for Her Majesty's Ministers in the hall of the Bristol Volunteer Corps. (2) Covers were laid for some 1,400 persons, and though neither Derby, incapacitated and shortly to retire from the leadership, nor Disraeli was present, (3) Pakington, who delivered the first major speech in reply to the toast of "The Army, Navy, Yeomanry, and Volunteers," together with Stanley and Hardy represented the Cabinet. Stanley replied to "Her Majesty's Ministers", ranging widely over several legislative fields, including parliamentary reform. His statement on education was particularly bold, for he now contemplated "... a wise, a large, and a well considered measure for the education of the people. That is a question with which the Conservative party are not one whit behind their opponents in the desire, and, as I believe in the power to deal. Lord Derby was the founder of that system of national teaching which still, though in a modified form, subsists in Ireland. My friend Sir John Pakington who sits beside me, long ago took up the question as it relates to England; others of us have helped, according to the measure of our ability, and I think the present time is favourable." Gathorne Hardy, however, in reply to the toast of the "House of Commons" spoke in more cautious vein. Though he accepted that since children were in some instances compelled to attend school it was

---

(1) This was no doubt a reference to the compromise on the Conscience Clause worked out between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Marlborough in December 1867 and January 1868.

(2) Stanley was well aware of the differences which existed between Derby and Disraeli on the education question. See Disraeli to Stanley, 17 January 1868, printed in W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1929), II, 311.

(3) Johnny, Pakington's elder son, and Denison, who made a short speech, were among the guests.

the Government's duty to ensure that sufficient schools were provided for them, hasty action on the education issue must be tempered by the necessity to "improve and not destroy". (1)

Disraeli engaged in urgent consultations with Pakington, Hardy, Manners and Northcote at the end of January, and Pakington wrote on the 26th, "I feel rather anxious on the subject. Stanley in his excellent speech at Bristol, pledged the Government on the Education question, and Hardy said enough to show, though it did not amount to open dissent, that he did not like Stanley's language. I fear all your tact and conciliatory powers will be required." (2) Disraeli concluded from these representations and from separate interviews with Cabinet colleagues on 30 January that "Any forced decisions at this moment, on conscience clauses and rating, and boards of managers, would break up the Cabinet," and he accordingly decided that for legislation "to be preliminary and not insignificant, the institution of an Education Minister was necessary." (3) This proposal was, however, complicated by Marlborough's insistence that the Lord President should hold that post ex officio which would thus "seem to close the House of Commons to the Minister for Education." (4) Bruce and

---

(1) Report of the meeting held on 22 January. The Times, 23 January 1868.

(2) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/92, Pakington to Disraeli, 26 January 1868. See P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 108, for advice offered by Northcote and Walpole.

(3) Disraeli to Derby, 30 January 1868. This letter together with those of 4 February to the Queen, and 6 February to Derby, are printed in W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1929), II, 313-15. See also Hughenden Mss. B/XX/S/478, Derby to Disraeli, 29 January 1868. Derby favoured an educational census as a first step, but Disraeli thought this approach over-cautious.

(4) Disraeli to the Queen, 4 February 1868. Though as Disraeli noted, Lord John Russell had briefly held the post while a member of the Commons.

Forster were, as Pakington informed Disraeli, waiting anxiously in the wings, however, and Pakington pressed for some action.

"Mr Forster joined me as I left the House last evening, and you may like to know the substance of our brief talk.

I asked if he expected any debate on Education this evening - he thought probably not much as there would be no question before the House. He intended himself to make a short statement, perhaps a quarter of an hour, the principal object of which would be to say on behalf of Mr. Bruce, that his decision whether or not to introduce his Bill, would depend entirely in the course taken by the Government.

He therefore hoped to receive from you this evening on the part of the Government, a distinct announcement of what we propose to do.

I hope from what Hardy has told me, that the Duke of M. has waived all objections, and that the Education Minister is practically settled." (1)

Forster's question was put publicly in the Commons on 14 February. (2) He began with references to the equivocal paragraph on education contained in the Queen's Speech, (3) and to Derby's lukewarm attitude in the Lords. But he also drew attention to more propitious utterances, to Stanley's speech at Bristol, including his reference to Pakington, and to the change of policy of the Voluntaryists

---

(1) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/93, Pakington to Disraeli, 15 February 1868. It would seem that Marlborough's position on the issue of an Education Minister at this time has been misinterpreted by Anthony Bishop and Wilfred Jones, 'The Act that never was: the Conservative Education Bill of 1868', History of Education, I (2), 1972, 163.

(2) Hansard, CXC, 734-41, 14 February 1868.

(3) This spoke of approaching the subject with "a full appreciation both of its vital Importance and of its acknowledged Difficulty."

who, "now admitted that the facts were too strong for them to struggle against, and were anxious, under certain safeguards, for a good system of State education." Forster argued too that the very strongest grounds for political co-operation on this issue already existed, since Bruce's Bill of 1867, to which Egerton and he had added their support had been based upon that of 1857 to which both Pakington and Stanley had signed their names. "The supporters of that Bill, (1) moreover, were the successors of those who induced the noble Lord (2) and the right hon. Baronet (3) to bring forward the Manchester and Salford Bill in 1852. (4) That principle of rating, which had now gained considerable popularity, was advocated by the right hon. Baronet at a time when it was by no means popular, and he was glad to find by the excellent draft Report which he submitted to the Committee over which he presided, that the right hon. Baronet had not changed his opinion. For these reasons he thought it desirable that the settlement of the question should be undertaken by the present Government." (5) Disraeli, (6) characteristically on procedural grounds, refused to give Forster any definite answer, though he did declare the Government's intention to introduce some measure for elementary education in the present session. Accordingly Bruce introduced an amended Bill, again with the support

---

(1) The Bill of 1867.
(2) Stanley.
(3) Pakington. Forster put the names in this order not to imply Stanley's leadership of the cause in 1857, but because he was referring to Stanley's Bristol speech and trying to emphasize Stanley's long-standing concern for education.
(4) In error for 1857.
(5) Hansard, CXC, 737-8, 14 February 1868.
(6) Ibid., 741-2.

of Forster and Egerton, on 17 March. (1) Bruce then advised the House that "the present Bill contained all the main provisions and principles of the Bill of 1867, with the addition of machinery for its compulsory enforcement where the existence of educational destitution had, after formal inquiry, been proved." (2) Gathorne Hardy offered no opposition on behalf of the Government. (3)

Disraeli kissed hands on 28 February 1868, and with a Cabinet noticeably weaker than that with which Derby had begun his third administration in 1866, with a House of Commons in which Whigs, Liberals, Radicals and Irish combined had a majority of some seventy members over the Conservatives, and with the particular problems of Ireland looming large, (4) was doubtless even more concerned to have "education discussed by Dukes and Bishops". (5)

---

(1) For the background to Bruce's Bill of 1868 see A.J. Marcham, 'Educating our Masters: Political Parties and Elementary Education 1867 to 1870', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (2), 1973, 184-8 and Henry Roper, 'Toward an Elementary Education Act for England and Wales, 1865-1868', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXIII (2), 1975, 198-201.

(2) Hansard, CXC, 1817, 17 March 1868.

(3) The Government was at this time engaged with the Public Schools Bill which was given a second reading on 14 February and referred to a Select Committee on 20 March. Walpole was in charge of this measure in the Commons. Montagu was not nominated as a member of the Select Committee, though he was appointed to Samuelson's Committee, nominated on 27 March "to inquire into the provisions for giving instruction in theoretical and applied Science to the Industrial Classes."

(4) Pakington wrote to Disraeli offering advice on the Irish Church question. Pakington favoured disestablishment, but only modified disendowment. His letter of 14 March 1868 is printed in W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1929), II, 355.

(5) Disraeli to Derby, 6 February 1868. Printed in W.F. Monypenny and G.E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1929), II, 315.

Marlborough accordingly moved the first reading of the Government's Education Bill in the Lords on 24 March 1868. It was, in Disraeli's terminology, "strictly preparatory", or as Granville and Harrowby suspected, "only a portion of that which was originally drafted for consideration." (1)

Marlborough did not claim that the Bill was a complete measure, but he did deny "that the wants which have to be supplied are so great as to demand any violent or extraordinary remedy." (2) He devoted much of his speech indeed to arguing against a school rate, and even cited Lowe's testimony before Pakington's Committee on this point, although Lowe's view of this matter had since changed. He extolled instead the systems of school pence and voluntary contributions which "would be almost entirely superseded if you adopted a system of general rating." (3) And yet Marlborough, when speaking of the administration of public education, declared that "The great defect of the existing system is that it is not initiative, but merely follows in the wake of voluntary effort." (4) The Bill embodied five main principles. The first was "to enable the Crown to appoint an additional Secretary of State for the Educational Department," the second "to put into an Act of Parliament those portions of the Revised Code which relate to the terms on which the grant is dispensed." (5) The third proposal was to increase the grant system, by relaxing the rule on connection with a religious denomination, and for schools with less

---

(1) Hansard, CXCII, 407, 18 May 1868.
(2) Hansard, CXCI, 107, 24 March 1868. Marlborough's speech is ibid., 105-29.
(3) Ibid., 113.
(4) Ibid., 119.
(5) Ibid., 120.

than sixty-five pupils the certificated teacher requirement. Improvements in building grants and in grants to evening schools would also be made. Fourthly the new Secretary of State would be empowered to order an educational census in any district. Finally Marlborough accepted "that where only one school is maintained in a parish the principle of the Conscience Clause is just and equitable." (1)

There is a deep sense of contradiction underlying the Bill of 1868. For example, Marlborough made much of the power to require an educational census, but also declared that the Government had not thought it proper to require compulsory rating or compulsory attendance. Was this indeed a preparatory measure for a new basis for national education, or an attempt to prop up the old? Marlborough claimed it was both. "We believe that we are proposing that which will lay the foundation of an ample system of education. We propose to confirm and place in a definite shape that which is already in existence." (2) Opposition reaction was in general that whilst the provisions of the Bill were in themselves unobjectionable as far as they went, they did not go far enough. (3)

On the second reading on 27 April the Earl of Airlie moved an amendment that the Bill be read "this Day Three Months". (4) He based his case upon the restricted nature of the measure which he characterized as being little more than a set of Minutes, as compared with Pakington's scheme for national education. He reminded Marlborough firstly that "A very eminent Member of the Government (Sir John Pakington) was in favour of a Conscience Clause

---

(1) Ibid., 126. This allowed the withdrawal of children from any lesson.
(2) Ibid., 129.
(3) See the speeches of Granville, ibid., 129-34 and Russell, ibid., 134-6.
(4) Hansard, CXCI, 1305-9, 27 April 1868.

much more extensive than that contained in this Bill." (1) Secondly Airlie produced evidence to show that the existing system was incapable of being extended into a truly national system. "Two years ago a Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the subject of Education at the instance of Sir John Pakington, and before that Committee a great number of witnesses were examined - among others Mr. Lingen, who gave it as his opinion that it would be impossible to extend the present system throughout the whole country; that we must fall back upon local organization of some kind." (2) That local organization, Airlie argued, must be based upon rates. "Sir John Pakington was also in favour of rate-supported schools; while a meeting held at Manchester, at which the compulsory rating principle was advocated, was largely attended by clergymen, by whom no disapproval of it was expressed." (3) Airlie concluded that the Education Bills now before the Lords and Commons were totally different in principle, that one must kill the other, and "that the Bill of the Government was a complete abnegation of the principle that the State ought to educate the people." (4)

Airlie's amendment, however, was subsequently withdrawn and the Bill received a second reading. Granville, who prevented a division, (5) in deciding to support Marlborough's Bill, approved its admission of the principle of a conscience clause, and, perhaps with the example of the recent Reform Bill in mind, hoped that in its passage through the Commons the Bill's scope might well be

---

(1) Ibid., 1306.
(2) Ibid., 1308.
(3) Ibid., 1309.
(4) Ibid.
(5) Hansard, CXCII, 408, 18 May 1868.

enlarged. Russell, too, favoured these tactics, but they came to nothing, however, for on 18 May Marlborough announced that the Bill had been withdrawn. (1) The session ended in a desultory way with Montagu in the Commons unhappily countering the arguments of members who took up the claims of those who had hoped that their schools would qualify for the new grants. (2) One significant outcome was Granville's speech of 18 May which showed that another leading Whig had been won over to Pakington's Draft Report. Granville on that occasion "congratulated the Lord President on the personal relief which he must feel," on having abandoned the Bill, but called on the Government nevertheless to "embody a Conscience Clause in a Minute of the Committee of Council."(3) Granville recounted his own evidence to Pakington as to why he had himself when in office not brought the conscience clause before Parliament. But, Granville now argued, by bringing the matter to Parliament the Government had shown its acceptance, though hedged about by restrictions, of the conscience clause principle, and the time for its full implementation had arrived. Pakington had rightly interpreted Granville's earlier caution on this matter as stemming partly from a feeling of conciliation toward the Church of England, and partly from the belief that if the principle were once admitted it must be universally enforced. The Church, the country, the Government and Parliament, however, Granville concluded, were now ready for the change. In reference to the Commons Granville argued, "Not one of the large Liberal majority was known to hold opinions on this subject different from those supported by him and confirmed by Sir John Pakington."

---

(1) Ibid., 405-6.
(2) For example, Hansard, CXCII, 952-3, 28 May 1868, Montagu in reply to Baines and Bruce.
(3) Hansard, CXCII, 407-11, 18 May 1868.

Now that official Conservative support had also been shown the conscience clause issue could and should be speedily resolved. On 24 June Bruce's Bill was, after a short debate, also withdrawn. Bruce and Dixon on this occasion produced several statistics to show the extent of educational deficiencies, and both took Montagu to task for his optimistic view of the situation. Dixon's figures, for example, supplied by the Birmingham Education Society, showed a considerable want of schooling in that city. (1)

The third government of which Pakington was a member thus showed a greater initiative in promoting national education than either of its predecessors. True one of its first actions had been to circumvent Pakington's Draft Report, but subsequently some steps had been taken to amend the Revised Code, and an Education Bill (2) had been prepared and introduced. Such a record bears comparison with those of earlier Liberal governments. Moreover the Conservatives had been responsible for the Reform Act which had significantly affected thinking on education, and Disraeli at times certainly now saw education as one of the key political issues of the day. But the years 1866-8 had also revealed Conservative doubts and divisions on education. If a new basis for national education were needed, and if as Pakington believed, rating, a universal conscience clause and local control were to be essential features of such a basis, such a measure would be more likely to emanate from a Liberal government in which Bruce and Forster were already firm

---

(1) See A.J. Marcham, 'The Birmingham Education Society and the 1870 Act', Journal of Educational Administration and History, VIII (1), 1976. On the Conscience Clause issue see A.J. Marcham, 'A Question of Conscience: the Church and the "Conscience Clause" 1860-1870', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XXII (3), 1971.

(2) A Bill which Anthony Bishop and Wilfred Jones, 'The Act that never was: the Conservative Education Bill of 1868', History of Education, I (2), 1972, characterize as "radical, far-sighted and progressive".

supporters of Pakington's views, and to which Gladstone, Granville and Lowe had recently become converted. However, since a Conservative government had attempted to legislate in 1868, the party could not logically oppose the principle of an act, or the specific proposals of a conscience clause, a Minister of Education, and an educational census. Conservatives moreover, once the necessity for a measure became clear, would tend to support any Liberal bill which resisted the arguments for compulsory, free and secular education of the Radical wing, and gave scope for the continuation and extension of denominational schooling.

Disraeli, in his reply to the Queen's Speech, showed that he would now in his turn harry the government of the day on the education issue. He regretted that "there is no longer any mention made of a general measure of popular education. I cannot say I think that the circumstances which at present exist render such legislation on our part less necessary - I would say less urgent - than a year ago; and I am surprised to find that Her Majesty's Government seem to be of opinion that this is a subject which can be avoided." (1) Disraeli, who regretted the loss of the Conservative Bill of the previous year thought it impossible that the present session should lapse without the achievement of a general measure of education. Gladstone, with other issues, including endowed schools, (2) on his agenda replied defensively, and on 8 March de Grey, the Lord President, confirmed that the general question of education would not be tackled in 1869. (3)

---

(1) Hansard, CXCIV, 72, 16 February 1869.
(2) Forster introduced the first reading of the Endowed Schools Bill on 18 February 1869.
(3) Hansard, CXCIV, 811-15, 8 March 1869.

De Grey's statement occasioned dismay amongst some of the Government's supporters, and in the Commons George Melly, Liberal member for Stoke, and a supporter of "compulsory attendance and free municipal schools" as the essential basis for national education, argued in moving for a Select Committee on the state of education in large towns that the House must be "thoroughly convinced that the facts and figures will justify so extreme a course." (1) George Dixon was similarly "most anxious that the House should, at any rate, do something towards preparing a basis on which legislation might take place next Session." (2) Henry Fawcett, the blinded Liberal member for Brighton, a supporter both of compulsory rating and compulsory attendance, opposed the motion since he believed that the Government already had enough information at its disposal, and that further inquiry would lead to further delay. He moved an amendment to this effect, but after some lengthy exchanges in which Adderley, Buxton, Sandon, Mundella, Jacob Bright and Henley were to the fore, the motion and the amendment were both withdrawn. The key contributions, however, came from Forster (3) and Pakington. (4) Forster agreed in general with Fawcett that "The time for Committees had passed, and the time for measures had come, and he believed for comprehensive measures," (5) but he did accept the principle of a return for Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester. Moreover, in contrast to Montagu, he declared his faith in the statistics collected by the educational societies of Birmingham and Manchester, and accepted that compulsory attendance might be necessary.

---

(1) Hansard, CXCIV, 1191, 12 March 1869.
(2) Ibid., 1207.
(3) Ibid., 1235-43.
(4) Ibid., 1247-9.
(5) Ibid., 1237.

Pakington made five points in his speech, the first of which insisted that whilst Melly's action in raising the education issue was commendable, the motion itself should be resisted, on the grounds that "The House was amply furnished with facts, and it now only remained for it to grapple with those facts, and to proceed, as soon as it could conveniently do so, to legislation on the subject." (1) Bruce voiced his approval of this part of Pakington's speech, and Pakington then proceeded to appeal to Bruce and Forster in particular, and to the Liberal Government in general, not to desert its duty. "He had repeatedly said that we should never solve the great problem of national education until we had arrived at the fulfilment of two conditions - the one the existence of a strong Government, the other the existence of a Government which was not only strong but determined to settle the question. The first of these conditions was realized, and he was well aware that his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department, as well as the Vice-President of the Committee of Council, had long had the subject sincerely at heart. Under these circumstances they had a right to expect that the question would be settled, and it was time that it should be settled." (2) Pakington thirdly opposed the views of those like Henley who believed that further information should be collected, and the argument of Adderley who urged that the existing school system should be given a further trial. Pakington "thought that the present system had been tried long enough, and what they wanted

---

(1) Ibid., 1248.
(2) Ibid. For an analysis of the Liberal Cabinet of 1868 and Education see R.E. Aldrich, 'Education and the Political Parties, 1830-1870', London University M.Phil thesis, 1970, 349-53.

was a better one." (1) He commended the Government for its Endowed Schools Bill, "the next best and most judicious step," and concluded by urging "that next Session there would be no more inquiry, but a comprehensive measure upon this subject." (2)

Pakington's speech on this occasion was totally different from Disraeli's political manoeuvrings or Adderley and Henley's pleas for delay. Pakington genuinely sought a speedy answer to the education problem as he saw it, genuinely believed that Gladstone's government was uniquely positioned to supply such a solution, and saw Bruce and Forster, his two former colleagues on the Select Committee, as the main agents for achieving a bill in accordance with their proposals of 1867 and 1868 as based on his own schemes of 1855 and 1857. Forster, in 1869, was much employed in piloting the Endowed Schools Bill through the Commons, but on 19 July when moving the Education estimates he did engage in a review of the quantity of schooling which many members recognized as a preparatory statement for the measure of the next session. But whilst Dixon, Melly, and Mundella urged on Forster's resolve, Montagu, for the Conservatives, deplored Forster's statement as an attempt to belittle the existing system. He challenged Forster's estimates of educational deficiency, and argued that the chief problem was the apathy and negligence of parents. A rating system was unnecessary and would moreover produce a secular system of education which would be repugnant to the nation.

Though Montagu's resistance continued on 17 February 1870, when Forster moved the first reading of the Education Bill, general Conservative reaction was now favourable, and Sandon in deploring Montagu's speech on that occasion, denied "that the Members of the Opposition were insensible

---

(1) Hansard, CXCIV, 1248-9, 12 March 1869.
(2) Ibid., 1249.

to the great educational deficiency at present existing." (1) Hardy welcomed the Bill as the triumph of the Union over the League, and the National Society, though its public protests still continued, now accepted the inevitability of a conscience clause. (2)

Pakington rose on 17 February "to state that I never listened to a speech with more heartfelt satisfaction than to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman in introducing this measure. I have worked many years for the accomplishment of this object, and which I should rejoice to see settled under the auspices of my right hon. Friend. And I am here to speak the sentiment of many friends near me on this side of the House ... ." (3) Pakington refrained from entering into any consideration of details, but he did declare his approval of the principle of the Bill "that whenever public money is granted then a Conscience Clause should be in existence." (4) At the same time he took the opportunity of commending compulsory attendance: "I do not believe that without compulsion we can have anything like a satisfactory national system that will bring, as it ought to do, education to the door of every citizen of this country, however humble." (5) The one serious omission for which Pakington took the Government to task was the matter of the Ministry of Education: "... the country ought to require from Her Majesty's Government that the Education Department should be a distinct Department of the State, with a responsible Minister at its head. I think every one will agree with

---

(1) Hansard, CXCIX, 480, 17 February 1870.
(2) P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 133-40, contains a useful summary of Conservative reactions to the Bill.
(3) Hansard, CXCIX, 483, 17 February 1870. Forster had earlier, ibid., 448, paid tribute to Pakington "who on this question of education, as we must all acknowledge, has been always in advance of most of us on both sides of the House." Forster noted in his diary, "Pakington very strong in favour." Quoted in T.W. Reid, Life of the Right Hon. W.E. Forster (2 vols., 1888), I, 477.
(4) Hansard, CXCIX, 486, 17 February 1870.
(5) Ibid., 487.

me when I say that my only regret with respect to my right hon. Friend's speech is that he did not make it as the responsible Minister of Public Instruction (Ministerial cheers)." (1) John Walter supported Pakington both on this point, and upon his concern about the small parochial unit in rural areas.

Reception in the press and in the country was initially very favourable, and the Conservative Standard praised the Bill. But the details, particularly the proposal to authorize denominational teaching in rate supported schools soon provoked opposition. On 9 March a deputation from the League, with some 40 Liberal members in the van, waited in protest upon Gladstone, (2) and two days later Cowper-Temple led the Union's delegates, including a contingent of more than 50 Conservative M.P.'s, to urge the Prime Minister to stand firm against the malcontents within his own party.

On 14 March, on the second reading, George Dixon moved his amendment in opposition to any "settlement which leaves the question of religious instruction in schools supported by public funds and rates to be determined by local authorities." (3) The debate was continued on 15 and 18 March, but eventually Dixon's amendment was withdrawn and the second reading given. In this internal Liberal warfare of the second reading Pakington played no part, no doubt for fear of exacerbating the situation. Indeed the Government needed quiet Conservative support

---

(1) Ibid., 484.
(2) See National Education League, Verbatim Report of the Proceedings of a Deputation ... on Wednesday, March 9, 1870 (1870); Daily Telegraph, 10 March 1870, which referred to the occasion as a "physical force deputation"; and A.R. Williams, 'A Deputation of the National Education League, March 9, 1870', History of Education Society Bulletin, XII, 1973.
(3) Hansard, CXCIX, 1930, 14 March 1870.

if it were to outwit its own backbench militants, and Gladstone on 18 March was reduced to trying to convince his own supporters that Conservative approval was not of itself an argument against the Bill.

Nevertheless the Cabinet was forced into significant changes and on 14 June Lowe's proposal on the increased grants and the separation of denominational schools from the School Boards was accepted, and the Cowper-Temple formula approved. When Gladstone two days later, after a delay of three months, moved the committee stage, Disraeli requested that the debate be adjourned to give the House time to consider what was in fact virtually a new Bill. Pakington had become particularly anxious about the delay in April and May, and on 12 April for example had urged on Gladstone his own "earnest and anxious hope that nothing will be allowed to prevent the progress of the Education Bill." (1) Now when on 20 June Henry Richard moved an amendment seconded by Dilke in favour of compulsion and secular education, Pakington faced the delicate task of opposing certain changes in the Bill with sufficient force to prevent any further concessions to the secular party, but in such a manner as to dissuade alarmed Conservatives from impeding the Bill's further progress.

The most significant effect of the Government changes was to induce Pakington to abandon his "intention at this stage of the Bill to move an Instruction to the Committee empowering it to insert a clause for the appointment of a regular Minister of Education." (2) Instead he sought to promote harmony, by praising Gladstone for his "charity and Christian feeling" and Richard for his "conciliatory and tolerant spirit". He reminded the House that "The object we have in view is the education of the children of

---

(1) Hansard, CC, 1718, 12 April 1870.
(2) Hansard, CCII, 566, 20 June 1870.

the masses of this country," (1) and not any particular denominational or party triumph. He asked the Government to consider three points, the need to ensure an adequate supply of well qualified teachers, the restoration of the year of grace, and a guarantee of the permanence of the increased annual grant to existing schools. His immediate concern, however, was to ensure the place of religious teaching in schools. Pakington therefore objected not to the conscience clause, for which "I have always contended, under obloquy and opposition," (2) not to the timetable conscience clause, but to a timetable conscience clause in which Parliament decreed that religious instruction should only be given at the beginning or end of the school day. Pakington also objected to Richard's attempt to exclude religion from the schools altogether, and suggested on the contrary, "that if you adopt the negative proposition to reject the formularies and the catechisms you ought to adopt the positive proposition that the Bible should be read." (3) Forster, who followed Pakington in the debate, assured him that his views would "be thoroughly considered by the Government," (4) and Richard's amendment was overwhelmingly defeated by 421 votes to 60.

During these debates several favourable references were made to Pakington's position upon the place of religious teaching in schools. Thus Vernon Harcourt on 21 June advised that the majority "did not want secular and they did not want denominational teaching, but they wanted something that was neither one nor the other," (5) whilst E.S. Gordon on 23 June in appealing for concessions from both sides advised that "The views he entertained on this subject were in exact accordance with those expressed

---

(1) Ibid., 567.
(2) Ibid., 570.
(3) Ibid., 572.
(4) Ibid., 574.
(5) Hansard, CCII, 644, 21 June 1870.

by the right hon. Member for Droitwich (Sir John Pakington)."[1] Encouraged by such support Pakington determined to press on with an amendment of his own, which he moved on 30 June. It read "The Holy Scriptures shall form part of the daily reading and teaching in such school, but no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught therein."[2] Gladstone had previously announced the Government's determination to resist the amendment, however. Forster regretfully confirmed that decision on the night, and Pakington was defeated by 250 votes to 81. Pakington's statement was too precise for a Liberal Government which numbered amongst its supporters those who wished to see secular education only, and others who still hoped for denominational teaching in the new Board schools.[3] Nevertheless Pakington's principle was not wholly lost for the London School Board, and many others, required the use of the Bible in all its schools.[4]

Pakington played a full part in the long committee stage of the Bill, and continued to regret the exclusion of religious teaching. Forster throughout the debates referred to Pakington in the most complimentary terms. On 20 June he acknowledged that Pakington's Bill of 1857 "was the parent of the measure introduced by myself and the Home Secretary,"[5] and on 30 June he regretted having to oppose the amendment of "one who had extended such

---

(1) Hansard, CCII, 827, 830, 23 June 1870.
(2) Hansard, CCII, 1265, 30 June 1870.
(3) See Forster's view, "you may teach Transubstantiation in any Board school in England so long as you don't teach it out of the Penny Catechism." Quoted in D.C. Lathbury (ed.), Correspondence on Church and Religion of W.E. Gladstone (2 vols., 1910), II, 128.
(4) P. Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform (1967), 140, notes the parts played by Sandon and W.H. Smith in achieving this.
(5) Hansard, CCII, 591, 20 June 1870. This was a reference to the Bill of 1867.

consistent, disinterested, and useful support to the Bill." (1)

The third reading on 22 July saw Dixon noting wryly that the Bill's success had depended in large part upon "the almost constant and earnest support which was given to it by the Opposition," (2) and indeed when Forster rose to speak he did so "chiefly ... to express my thanks to the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir John Pakington) ... ." (3) Pakington's calm temper and wisdom during the debates had been widely appreciated, not least by Melly who, though a Liberal, commended Pakington "who throughout these discussions had shown the most conciliatory disposition, and he wished that the same feeling of conciliation and kindly appreciation of motives had been shown by the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister." (4) Pakington for his part regretted the angry tones of Dixon and Miall, hoped that the measure would nevertheless be given a fair trial, and offered his congratulations to the Government in general and to Forster in particular. He regretted still that "there is no mention made of religion except in a restrictive sense," (5) and the introduction of the ballot. Nevertheless overall Pakington accepted the measure "with thankfulness and with joy". "I should be ungrateful and inconsistent if I did not accept it with pleasure, for my right hon. Friend the Vice-President of the Council, with whom it has been my fortune to confer on many occasions on the subject, knows that the Bill contains almost every one of those provisions for which, humbly but earnestly, I have laboured for the last 15 or 20 years." (6) The 1870 Act was in a real sense the belated, but nonetheless genuine fulfilment of Pakington's long parliamentary championship of the cause of national education.

---

(1) Hansard, CCII, 1268, 30 June 1870.
(2) Hansard, CCIII, 738, 22 July 1870.
(3) Ibid., 758.
(4) Ibid., 755.
(5) Ibid., 754.
(6) Ibid., 755.

In the last decade of his life, however, Pakington continued to press for further reform. He used his presidential address to the annual congress of the N.A.P.S.S. at Leeds to advise the country that the Education Acts of 1869 and 1870 "must be regarded as the foundation of the changes which are necessary rather than as the final settlement of the problem which has been so long and so warmly debated." (1) Pakington's speech on that occasion ranged over a variety of issues, technical education, compulsion, the education of girls, and drew attention specifically to what he continued to regard as the major omission from the 1870 Act, the appointment of a Minister of Education. Pakington returned to this theme on several occasions in these years, as in a speech at the Bristol Trade School, when he engaged in a lengthy criticism of the Committee of Council, reminded his audience of Ripon's admission of differences between himself and Forster, the two "Kings of Brentford" as Pakington designated them, and called instead for "one responsible Minister of public instruction." (2) He also continued to press this issue in Parliament, both in the Commons, (3) and from 1874 in the Lords. (4) His resolution of 22 May 1874 which asked "... that the Committee of Council on Education should be superseded by the appointment of a Minister of Public Instruction, who should be entrusted with the care and superintendence of all matters relating to national encouragement of science and art and popular education," (5) was, however, defeated. Though Pakington on that occasion adduced the evidence to the Select Committee

---

(1) Reported in The Times, 5 October 1871.
(2) From a report in The Times, 22 December 1873.
(3) For example, Hansard, CCXI, 621, 10 May 1872.
(4) As Baron Hampton. In this thesis he is referred to throughout as Pakington.
(5) Hansard, CCXIX, 688, 22 May 1874.

of 1865 and the Conservative Bill of 1868 in support of his cause, the Duke of Richmond opposed the resolution on behalf of the Government. (1) Richmond, the Lord President, argued that he was the Minister of Education, and that the 1870 Act had in the long term diminished rather than increased the business of the central Department. With Granville also in opposition Pakington's resolution was rejected.

Pakington's second major criticism of the Act of 1870, that it did not require religious instruction, was for him another continuing cause for concern and action. Within Parliament he supported the principle of daily reading from the Bible, as in 1872 during the committee stage of the Education (Scotland) Bill. (2) In the country at large he approved of the 25th clause of the 1870 Act, (3) maintained that "our national character depended upon the proper religious instruction of the masses," (4) and commended the scheme of the Worcester School Board "to make education compulsory ... and to include religion in their system." (5) On the other hand, during a debate on the second reading of the Elementary Education Bill of 1876 (6) he voiced his disapproval of the policy of the Birmingham School Board which had banished religious teaching from its schools. Indeed Pakington's championship of religious instruction restored him in the eyes of the National Society and in 1876 at a meeting convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury he carried a resolution deploring the exclusion of Bible teaching from

---

(1) Some Conservatives were beginning to see the Lord President as a useful check on the Vice-President. They particularly feared the prospect of a Radical Liberal Minister of Education.
(2) Hansard, CCXI, 311, 6 May 1872.
(3) This empowered School Boards to pay the fees of necessitous children at the schools of their parents' choice. See Pakington's speech at Leeds reported in The Times, 5 October 1871.
(4) Pakington's speech at Bristol, reported in The Times, 22 December 1873.
(5) Pakington's speech on the occasion of the formal opening of the Worcester Board Schools. Reported in The Times, 8 September 1873.
(6) Hansard, CCXXXI, 811, 8 August 1876.

schools. (1) Compulsion was a principle to which Pakington had come but reluctantly, but after 1870 he fully appreciated its importance and in 1874 asked Richmond "whether the Education Department had in contemplation any measures intended to correct the serious evil of irregular attendance?" (2) Another matter on which he pressed the Government on that occasion was the importance of "a system of providing trained teachers for the middle classes." (3)

Finally one should notice Pakington's increasing concern, in his declining years, with the importance of technical and scientific education. He was much impressed by Scott Russell's work on Technical Education, with the views of Lyon Playfair, and the lessons to be drawn from the 1867 Paris Exhibition and the Prussian victory in 1871. (4) In 1872 Pakington presented the prizes to the scholars of the Commercial Travellers Schools at Pinner, (5) and later in the year returned to Leeds to preside at the annual prize distribution to the successful pupils of the Leeds School of Art and Science. Science and technical education, Pakington declared on that occasion, "was one of the great considerations of the period." (6) At Bristol in 1873 Pakington referred to the reports of Playfair and Scott Russell as to the superiority of Germany and Switzerland in scientific and technical education, "and said it behoved those of them who cared for the commercial and manufacturing welfare of this country to see not only that the general

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/53. Diary, 24 May 1876. See also the entry for 21 June 1876 when he attended another Education conference at the National Society.
(2) Hansard, CCXX, 602, 29 June 1874.
(3) Ibid., 601.
(4) Pakington made reference to these points in his presidential address to the N.A.P.S.S. at Leeds in 1871.
(5) The Times, 24 June 1872.
(6) The Times, 8 October 1872.

education of this country was promoted but that technical education should be deemed of the very first importance."[1] In 1874 Pakington occupied the presidency of the Birmingham School of Design, [2] whilst later in the year he attended the ceremony for the inauguration of the Yorkshire School of Science. [3] Yorkshire became a new area of interest, and in 1879 he travelled to Rotherham to attend, in the company of Baines, the annual meeting of the Yorkshire Union of Institutes. [4] As Lord Hampton from 1874, freed from the burdens of ministerial office and Commons' attendance, [5] Pakington was able to indulge his catholic educational tastes. He was for example, Chairman of the Board of Visitors at Sandhurst and Woolwich, an active governor of Wellington College, [6] he attended a meeting at the Mansion House to inaugurate Cambridge University extension to London, [7] he presided at the Oxford Local Examinations at Birmingham, [8] and with Lyttelton attended the examination at the College for the Blind at Worcester.[9] Saltley College, the Victorian Asylum at Wandsworth, the

---

(1) The Times, 22 December 1873.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/52, Diary, 3 February 1875.
(3) Ibid., 6 October 1875.
(4) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/55, Diary, 4 June 1879.
(5) Though there were several duties still to perform, for example in 1874 as Chairman of the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations, and from 1875 as Chief Commissioner of the Civil Service.
(6) For example, Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/52, Diary entries for 30 June, 6 and 21 July 1875. Pakington chaired a committee on masters' salaries. See also D. Newsome, A History of Wellington College, 1859-1959 (1959), 123. Some years earlier "Sir John Pakington complained that the staff were incompetent and had a distressing tendency to oversleep in the morning so that they had occasionally to cancel their classes."
(7) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/52, Diary, 10 June 1875.
(8) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/53, Diary, 4 December 1876.
(9) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(1)/M/X/52, Diary, 30 October 1875.

Royal Academy of Music were other interests of long standing, this rich variety of institutions which he supported to the last were as essential in Pakington's view to a national education worthy of the name, as the educational legislation and rate-supported schools for which he had so long contended.

Chapter Nine

A CONCEPT OF NATIONAL EDUCATION

The nineteenth century was an age of nationalism, and national education a natural consequence. But the national education envisaged by the National Society might be very different from the national education championed by the National Public School Association, the National Education Union or the National Education League. Moreover even within such bodies concepts of national education changed as the century progressed. In 1812, no doubt, many members of the national church believed that the National Society might provide the basis, if not the whole, of national education, by 1870 such a prospect had much diminished. Though Pakington's concept of national education was never expounded in any major treatise, he had by the 1850's evolved a set of principles for the achievement of a national system to which he held fairly steadfast for the rest of his life, and which in 1870 were in large measure incorporated into the Forster Act. Why did Pakington believe so strongly in the importance of national education, and what type of national education did he envisage?

In the years prior to 1855 Pakington's arguments in favour of national education were frequently, though not necessarily predominantly, couched in terms which are today often categorized as those of 'social control'. (1) He did see education as a means of inculcating religion, virtue and duty, and of combating crime and vice. As chairman of quarter sessions for some quarter of a century

---

(1) See, for example, Richard Johnson, 'Educational Policy and Social Control in Early Victorian England', Past and Present, XLIX, 1970.

this was an understandable approach, for Pakington was well-acquainted with the origins and nature of crime. He knew that the vast majority of criminals who appeared before him were uneducated. His evidence to the Worcester Diocesan Board in 1843 showed that of all the prisoners committed in the previous six years only twenty-three could read and write well. Pakington's motion on that occasion called for "a sound religious education according to the principles of the Church of England, as being, under the blessings of Almighty God, the best remedy that can be devised." (1) Pakington, in his speech at the Manchester Athenaeum in 1856 recounted the story of a beggar boy who informed him "I begs as long as people will give me anything, and when they won't I steals." (2) Pakington himself went on on that occasion "to call attention to that branch of the subject of education which related to destitute and vagrant children - the seed from which annually a great harvest of crime was gathered." (3) Pakington was well aware of the magnitude, the national dimension, of this problem. McKerrow believed that in Manchester alone there were some 4,000 children for whom an institution of the Juvenile Refuge type was needed, whilst Guthrie had stated "That there were between 2,000 and 3,000 children in Edinburgh who were in a condition which required the provision of a ragged school in order to save them from crime." (4) Pakington's concern was well-known and when Winfield wrote soliciting Pakington's support for a committee to investigate means of improving education in the Birmingham area, he

---

(1) N.S.R.O. Report of the Worcester Diocesan Board of Education, 20 April 1843.
(2) The incident took place in the Cathedral close at Worcester in 1856, the ten year old boy had come from Market Drayton.
(3) The Times, 20 November 1856.
(4) Ibid.

began by reference to "the deep interest you take in the important subject of juvenile education as a prevention to juvenile crimes." (1)

Pakington's attempts to argue this case when introducing his Education Bill of 1855, however, were not wholly successful. He could find enough evidence from the prisons of Preston and Worcester, from the reports of H.M.I.'s Mitchell and Stewart, to justify "the opinion that neglected childhood and juvenile crime stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect," (2) but his attempt to demonstrate the overall connection between ignorance and crime by comparisons between Austria and England resulted in failure. Henley within Parliament, and Colquhoun without, (3) revealed the fallacies in his argument, and he became thereafter more cautious in his treatment of education and adult crime. Nevertheless Pakington raised the issue again in 1856, and in 1860 reported to the Commons that "The percentage of juvenile prisoners under fourteen years of age in Edinburgh Gaol, in 1848, was 5; in 1849, the year after the ragged school was established, it was reduced to 3; and in 1850 it became, as it was at present, only 1 and a small fraction."(4)

In place of crime and vice education would, in Pakington's opinion, implant duty: duty both to God and to his church. Pakington's emphasis upon the religious and moral purposes of education was again particularly evident in the years prior to 1855. His work for the Worcester Diocesan Board, his commitment to the National Society and to the Church Education Society were in accordance with these purposes, and indeed he justified

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/4/(111)/M/B/7a, Winfield to Pakington, 28 November 1856.
(2) Hansard, CXXXVII, 655, 16 March 1855.
(3) J.C. Colquhoun, Remarks on Sir John Pakington's Education Bill ... (1855).
(4) Hansard, CLX, 1278, 14 August 1860.

the Bill of 1855 upon such grounds. But opponents of Pakington's proposed measure argued rather that his scheme for rate-aided education would seriously weaken, or even destroy both the voluntary schools system, and the very concept of Christian duty which he sought to champion. Pakington's conjunction with the Secularists, and the 1857 Bill, developments which resulted from his Manchester excursion in 1856, seemed to confirm this view. Francis Close thus stated that "Sir John Pakington's proposition, though introduced by a Conservative and an undoubted friend to religion and the Church, would in its working have been more revolutionary, more secularizing, and mischievous, in the judgement of many practical men, than any other ... ." (1) Pakington's Athenaeum speech of November 1856 therefore, whilst it was not a sudden turning point, was symptomatic of his search for wider and more varied justifications for education. On that occasion he made reference to New York, to a report from its Board of Education in 1855, to the "multitude of youth who are to be trained in usefulness in society." His own concept of society was broadening, and with it his concept of the purposes of education. In this speech Pakington now defined sound elementary education as enabling "every citizen of this great country to learn his duty to God and to his Sovereign, and to cultivate his intellectual faculties, and so raise himself in his social position ... ." (2)

Pakington's social concern embraced many causes. The orphan, the blind, the deaf and dumb, the ticket of leave man, etc. attracted his interest, an interest which stemmed both from his awareness of the duty and responsibility

---

(1) F. Close, A few more words on Education Bills (1856), 4.
(2) The Times, 20 November 1856.

which his position in society entailed, and from that genuinely tender-hearted, romantic, vigorous approach to life which lurked behind his rather pompous and officious public image. Pakington's own life was a full and varied one. Born John Somerset Russell, he died Baron Hampton. But life was for him no simple successful progress. He buried two young wives and a daughter in law, his elder son and heir went mad. After thirty seven years of service he was humiliatingly ejected from his parliamentary constituency in 1874, and Westwood Park, his ancestral home, was after his death never occupied by his descendants, manfully though he tried to reverse his financial plight by taking an office job at the age of seventy-six. Though thrice a Conservative Cabinet minister, he was always an outsider, at heart a Peelite who had opposed repeal, and who, whilst approving financial stringency in the abstract, could never apply it in the particular. In his personal and political lives, therefore, he knew much pain, disappointment and despair. Though he had no personal experience of grinding poverty and deprivation, he had a concept of human dignity and worth, and sufficient imagination and first-hand observation, accurately to evaluate and appreciate the plight of the lowest ranks in society. Just as the Crimean War shattered British military complacency in 1854, so Pakington in 1855 in introducing his Education Bill sought to shatter complacency about the social system. "We find in one year, in one gaol an aggregate of 800 persons who never heard the name of the Saviour. We find in one year, in one gaol, 1,200 persons who never heard the name of Queen Victoria. We find in one year, in one gaol, 1,300 persons who did not know the months of the year. This, Sir, is ignorance not of religion only, but of everything, both secular and religious, which can tend to elevate human beings and make them worthy of the name ... and these are the men

who, when they transgress the laws of their country, are severely punished, though it is hardly just to consider them as responsible beings." (1) Pakington had no fear of knowledge. He continued, "In my humble opinion the noblest page in the statute book of England is that which says no man shall be destitute. I wish to see a parallel page in the statute book which shall say no man shall be ignorant."(2) This statement was greeted by cheers in the Commons and occasioned comment in both pamphlets and press. It became a recurring theme in his speeches, at Manchester in 1856, at Birmingham in 1857. (3) The powers of reason and intellect were, in Pakington's opinion, "God's best and most precious gift to the human race," their cultivation the most certain means of promoting "the character, the happiness, the real welfare of the labouring man." (4) Pakington saw ignorance in a religious and spiritual sense, but he also, as a man who personally exercised his many faculties to the full, regretted the waste of lives deliberately emptied by deprivation of those opportunities which knowledge alone could afford. In 1858 at Worcester in a speech to the local Union of Educational Institutes, Pakington declared that although, "It was said that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing;" he was not afraid of knowledge, but he was afraid of ignorance, with its headstrong passions and prejudices... ."(5) Pakington thus saw Mechanics' Institutes not as breeding grounds for political and social revolution but rather, "in the same light as he regarded the Universities in the higher ranks of life, viz., as a means of carrying

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 657, 16 March 1855.
(2) Ibid., 658-9.
(3) At the Manchester Athenaeum in 1856, and at the N.A.P.S.S. conference in 1857.
(4) The Times, 20 November 1856.
(5) The Times, 8 October 1858.

the knowledge already possessed by the students further than it had reached, and preparing them for taking higher and more honourable, as well as more useful positions in the particular condition of life for which they were destined." (1) Pakington had genuinely at heart "the interest and welfare of the people". He used this term in 1856 when concluding a speech on Russell's resolutions, (2) and two years later, when moving for the Education Commission, regretted that Parliament spent too much time on party struggles, and not enough on those matters which "affect only the welfare and the interest of the people." (3) In 1860, when moving a resolution on ragged and industrial schools he declared that the primary purpose of government grants for education should be not to help wealthy districts nor to promote science and art, worthy though these objects were, but "to aid in the education of that class of people who are unable to bear the expense of educating themselves." (4)

In the work of the N.A.P.S.S. Pakington's concern for education as a prime means for social progress found its natural expression. Fittingly he presided over the Education department in 1857, and in 1871 Pakington's commitment to the work of the N.A.P.S.S. (5) secured for him the presidency itself. At Leeds in October in his opening address he reiterated his conviction that Parliament devoted insufficient attention to "questions of domestic importance", and that "At the head of those questions which affect the welfare of the working classes still stands the great subject of national education." (6) But he added now,

---

(1) Ibid.
(2) Hansard, CXLI, 865, 10 April 1856.
(3) Hansard, CXLVIII, 1191, 11 February 1858.
(4) Hansard, CLX, 1270, 14 August 1860.
(5) See, for example, the reference by Chadwick in his paper read before the N.A.P.S.S. on 10 March 1870. Sessional Proceedings of the N.A.P.S.S. (1870), III (15), 283.
(6) The Times, 5 October 1871.

much to the disgust of The Times' leader writer, calls for "healthy homes at fair rents" and "wholesome food at fair cost". The movement of London slum dwellers into the countryside was for The Times a "preposterous idea", (1) but the Leeds speech, and its clear identification with elements of the seven point programme of the New Social Movement, a movement in which Pakington played a leading role, reflected his developing social concern. The Times poured ridicule upon Pakington's ideas, and the New Social Movement has been characterized as in some respects "too absurd an episode to be regarded as very important," (2) but education, housing, open spaces and food were all matters for legislation in Disraeli's second government. Moreover the New Social Movement did seem to some contemporaries to prove "that Conservative leaders and representative working men can entertain the idea of exchanging views with each other towards adopting a common line of action for the improvement of the social condition of the people." (3)

Pakington would have agreed with that judgement. Social reform, education and knowledge were not merely to be dispensed like charity from above. In 1858 at Worcester Pakington argued "that one of our first duties was to see that those who had to exercise civil rights were made by education fit and competent to discharge them," (4) ten years later in a speech to the Droitwich Mechanics' Institute he maintained "that the greater the political power which was intrusted to the people the more important did it become to cultivate the intellect." (5)

---

(1) The Times, 6 October 1871.
(2) E.J. Feuchtwanger, Disraeli, democracy and the Tory Party (1968), 93.
(3) J.A. Campbell, The Education Question ... (1871), 5. This was the printed version of an address to the Glasgow Working Men's Association.
(4) The Times, 8 October 1858.
(5) The Times, 7 January 1868.

Pakington had a cautious approach towards democracy but he believed, to adapt Mann's comment, that in a constitutional monarchy as in a republic "ignorance is a crime". His general belief in participation was reflected in the Bill of 1855 which envisaged "local boards, popularly elected, acting upon that principle of self-government which we have so much at heart." (1) In 1859 he declared that "I, for one, have no hesitation in saying that I very much wish we could see an educational franchise adopted," (2) and repeated this view in the debate on the Elective Franchise Bill of 1866. Pakington on that occasion emphasized not only that the spread of education would cause many members to agree to the principle of a universal adult male franchise, but that conversely, some extension of the franchise "would afford a very great stimulus to education." (3)

National education also had, for Pakington, a national purpose, a national purpose which necessitated national responsibility. As he wrote to Derby "... this is what I want to arrive at - that the law of England should recognize the duty of providing for the mind as well as for the body." (4) As a Cabinet minister he had been responsible, at crucial times in the nation's history, for its colonies, its army and its navy. When as First Lord, in one of his greatest parliamentary speeches he moved the estimates in 1859 he spoke of the navy as being "that subject which touches more closely, perhaps, than any other the national pride of Englishmen and the safety and welfare of England." (5) But education too was for Pakington a matter of national pride, safety and welfare. It was essential to the nation's pride that its people

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 2114, 2 May 1855.
(2) Hansard, CLIII, 1003, 28 March 1859.
(3) Hansard, CLXXXIII, 1496, 30 May 1866.
(4) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 11 January 1855.
(5) Hansard, CLII, 882, 25 February 1859.

should be rescued from ignorance and despair. It was essential to the nation's safety that its armed forces should be supplied with intelligent and resourceful officers and men, its weapons of war designed and built by engineers and craftsmen of distinction. It was essential to the nation's welfare that its industry, commerce and agriculture could call upon the services of trained scientific and technical personnel, and all its inhabitants feel that in a caring Christian state there were both sufficient opportunities for personal individual advancement, and adequate safeguards against extreme hardship, to render unnecessary the more violent forms of social, economic and political upheaval.

As President of the Institute of Naval Architects Pakington played a leading part in the establishment of the School of Naval Architecture. In this institution his own interests of navy, education, science, technology, national strength, pride and welfare were happily united. Scott Russell in his Systematic Technical Education for the English People (1869), a volume with the declared object of moving "the minds of English Statesmen towards making the English Nation the Best Educated People in Europe", recorded Pakington's contribution to this cause, (1) a contribution which showed that Pakington's permanent association in the popular mind with the Warrior was not merely an accident of history but the symbol of a commitment to the nation which saw government votes on

---

(1) J. Scott Russell, Systematic Technical Education for the English People (1869), 7. Pakington himself maintained that Scott Russell's paper read in March 1863 to the Institute of Naval Architects had been the most important factor in the establishment of the school. Graham had abolished the former school at Portsmouth, and shipbuilders had been sending their sons to the French naval school in Paris. See Hansard, CLXXVI, 502, 30 June 1864.

defence and education not as rivalling each other but as complementary elements in a greater national purpose.

Pakington's justification of education in national terms pervaded all his work. In the 1850's he concentrated on the nation's educational position vis à vis other countries. He corresponded with Bentinck on the situation in Holland,(1) he regaled the Commons with statistics on the superior schooling of several European states and the U.S.A. . He declared that the absence of national education was "tarnishing our national character, and, I believe, sapping and undermining our national prosperity."(2) Prussia and Switzerland were countries whose educational systems Pakington particularly commended, and when the Voluntaryists were moved to sharp reply, (3) he pointed instead to other examples and asked "... why is a system which is good and beneficial for the Queen's subjects in Scotland and Upper Canada to be held as bad and inapplicable for the Queen's subjects in England?" (4) There were two main lines of resistance to Pakington's argument at this point. The first was that a national system of education was un-English and oppressive, the second that it was unnecessary and ineffective. Thus Unwin sought to show Pakington why a German system was inappropriate to English conditions, and on the second point called Pakington's attention to the conclusions of Samuel Laing who had written; "Reading and writing are requirements very widely diffused in Paris, in Italy, in America, in Prussia, in Sweden; but the people are not moral, nor religious,

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(ii)/M/P/52, Bentinck to Pakington, 23 January 1855.
(2) Hansard, CXXXVII, 641, 16 March 1855.
(3) For example, W.J. Unwin (ed.), Prussian Primary Education; its Organization and Results (1857).
(4) The Times, 20 November 1856.

nor enlightened, nor free, because they possess the means. They are not of educated mind in any true sense."(1)

Such confidence contrasted strongly with Pakington's belief, expressed in his presidential address to the Education department of the first N.A.P.S.S. congress at Birmingham that "... there was no better corrective for national pride than to reflect upon the ignorance and intellectual destitution of the masses around us." (2) Five years later in a presidential address to the Birmingham and Midland Institute, Pakington referred back to the Prince Consort's speech on the occasion of its foundation in 1855. Pakington in 1862 characterized Albert as "the patron of art, the friend of education; and the promoter of every social improvement which could increase the comfort or elevate the character of the people." (3) There were indeed many similarities in the approaches of the two men to education. In 1857 Pakington played a leading part in the three day educational conference held in Willis's Rooms under the presidency of the Prince who himself, in opening the proceedings, declared "... we have met today in the sacred cause of Education - of National Education." (4) The Royal College of Naval Architecture was established at Kensington,and Cole, who knew Pakington well, organized both the appropriation of the buildings and the establishment. Pakington was also fully acquainted with the work of Playfair, indeed he declared in a speech at the Bristol Trade School that "There were few public men for whose ability and whose high character he felt a greater respect than he did for Dr. Lyon Playfair." (5) The Bristol Trade School combined

---

(1) S. Laing, Notes of a Traveller (1850), 92.
(2) The Times, 14 October 1857.
(3) The Times, 1 October 1862. See also the report in the Birmingham Daily Gazette, 30 September 1862.
(4) The Times, 23 June 1857.
(5) The Times, 22 December 1873.

technical instruction with general education, and Pakington who made reference to the reports of Scott Russell and Playfair on the superiority of Swiss and German technical instruction, declared in his speech that "it behoved those of them who cared for the commercial and manufacturing welfare of this country to see not only that the general education of this country was promoted but that technical education should be deemed of the very first importance." (1) Pakington, though he believed that a good general education for all must necessarily precede, or at least accompany, technical instruction, had far more regard as he admitted in a speech to the annual meeting of the Kidderminster School of Art in 1865 for the effectiveness of the Science and Art Department than for the Committee of Council on Education. Pakington's concern for technical and scientific education thus in the 1860's became an important element in his concept of national education. It did not lead him to neglect the problem of the "neglected districts". As he told his local branch of the Church of England United Association of Schoolmasters in 1866, "It is a stain and a disgrace to England that we should have them ... ." (2) But once, and even while such gaps were being filled, scientific and technical education, an education which particularly required government stimulus and direction, was essential. Pakington saw clear threats to the national pride, safety and welfare of England in the poor showing of the country's products at the Paris Exhibition of 1867, and in the rise of Prussia and her army. In his presidential address to the N.A.P.S.S. congress in 1871, and on other occasions he made reference to the educational implications for this nation of these two events.

---

(1) Ibid.
(2) The Times, 8 October 1866.

Thus Pakington believed in the importance of national education for a variety of reasons. He saw the purposes of education as being both individual and corporate, religious and temporal. His views were usually balanced, and always sincerely expressed. A moderate scholar himself he had no exclusive or esoteric view of the purposes of education, but rather the broader aims consistent with the nature of a man of wide-ranging personal interests who was increasingly aware of the dynamic forces at work in the society of his day. As Pakington said at Bristol in 1873, "It was his strong belief that our national character depended upon the proper religious instruction of the masses just as much and in the same way, as our commercial and manufacturing prosperity depended upon a judicious and vigorous system of technical education." (1)

Whereas it was possible for Pakington to advocate education for a variety of reasons before a variety of audiences, and to claim that all were complementary, without necessarily arranging a precise order of priorities, to orchestrate these diverse elements into a national system of schools and colleges was more difficult. The fundamental criticism which was made of Pakington's concept of national education by Conservatives in politics and church alike was that whilst he protested his belief in the importance of the Christian purposes of education the effect of his actions was to maximise the secular as opposed to the religious element. To many of Pakington's contemporaries the only guarantee of religious education was religious, i.e. denominational, control. Once education became the province of the state, they argued, secularized schooling would become inevitable.

---

(1) The Times, 22 December 1873.

Pakington himself appreciated the role of the religious communions in the provision of education. He frequently commended Dissent for its contribution to the education of the urban areas of the nation, whilst his praise for the exertions of individual Anglican clergy was unstinting. In 1855 Granville supplied Pakington with information which showed "that during the last few months of last year 135 applications had been received by the Committee of Council from clergymen, and that in thirty-two out of those 135 cases the incumbents had been obliged to pay sums varying from £4 to £74 a year, or an average of £26 a year, for the purposes of keeping their schools open; while in the first few months of the present year, there had been 118 of those applications, and in thirty-four out of those 118 cases the deficiencies of the school incomes had to be made up by the clergyman in addition to his own pecuniary subscription." (1) Pakington, whilst praising such zeal, argued that this was an unsatisfactory financial basis for national education. At the Manchester Athenaeum in the following year he declared his belief, "although it might seem anomalous, that the very zeal of the clergy was one cause of the low quality of the schools; inasmuch as an immense number depended upon the clergy, who, from want of means, were unable to make them good, and therefore they were maintained at their present low and unsatisfactory level." (2) Moreover, from his experience of the Worcester Diocesan Board, Pakington knew the limitations, as well as the strengths, of locally-organized religious effort. Nor could he place too much faith in the National Society and the Church Education Society as organizing agencies at a national level. He deplored the exclusive tendencies of

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1819, 11 June 1855.
(2) The Times, 20 November 1856.

the National Society on such issues as the management [1] and conscience clauses, and in his speech to its annual general meeting of 1851 regretted that the society was "rather assuming the semblance of the conflict of rival parties - the contentions of rival sects, than meetings of Christian men having in view nothing but the promotion of the education of the poorer classes." [2] Pakington's speech to the annual meeting of the Church Education Society on 25 April 1854 thus included a tribute to the work of the National Society, a condemnation of its recent policy, and a declaration "that there is ample room for the exertions of all." He was convinced by 1854 that the religious bodies, though aided by government grants, had failed and would fail, to provide an adequate system of national education. This conviction led him to introduce the Bill for the better encouragement and promotion of Education in England in 1855 and to argue "that by the voluntary principle alone we cannot educate the people of this country as they ought to be educated... ."[3] But Pakington's solution, rate-supported schools controlled by elected local bodies, was strongly resisted by those who saw such proposals as "the death knell of our existing schools" [4] and the end of true religious teaching. What was lacking, it was argued, was not rate-aided schooling but adequate parental concern. Pakington was not unappreciative of the parental role, but he doubted the ability of a large proportion of the population to make more than a token contribution in either the financial or academic sense. "At a voluntary meeting the other day, I see it was stated that education

---

(1) He also deplored the Conservative Government's 'capitulation' on this issue. Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 6 June 1852.
(2) The Times, 5 June 1851.
(3) Hansard, CXXXVII, 660, 16 March 1855.
(4) F. Close, A few more words on Education Bills (1856), 10.

in this country was a matter of parental duty. Now, with all respect for those who attended that meeting, I think this further question, whether the industrious classes are in a position to educate themselves without help, might well have been raised." (1) It was, indeed, a legitimate question, but Pakington in the years 1855-7 found a formidable host ranged against him. The National Society and the Voluntaryists had their champions in Parliament, with Henley representing the former, and Graham, of all people, taking his arguments from a pamphlet by Baines. (2)

Pakington's disenchantment with the voluntary system was reflected in his alliance with the Manchester Radicals at the end of 1856. Northcote wrote at great length from Pynes urging the need to "reconcile the Rate system to the Denominational system", (3) but Pakington had moved beyond that position. The Bill of 1857, Pakington's letters of 23 January 1857 to Derby and Disraeli, (4) and the reluctant decision of his leaders to retain him within their counsels, mark an important step in the relationship between Conservatism, Education, Church and State. Though when the Bill failed, and the Newcastle Commission was followed by the Revised Code, Pakington faltered temporarily, as in the fourth and fifth recommendations of his draft resolutions of April 1862, (5) when he contemplated an increased role for diocesan boards, his fundamental solution remained popularly-elected

---

(1) Hansard, CXLI, 865, 10 April 1856. Pakington took issue with Cecil and Unwin on parental duty. There is a useful reference to this point in J.A. St. John, The Education of the People (1858), 110.
(2) Hansard, CXLII, 1353, 12 June 1856.
(3) Iddesleigh Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 50022, 248, Northcote to Pakington, 'Christmas' 1856.
(4) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 23 January 1857, and Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/29, Pakington to Disraeli, 23 January 1857.
(5) Hughenden Mss. B/XX/P/67a enclosed with B/XX/P/67, Pakington to Disraeli, 10 April 1862.

local education boards to supply the deficiencies in school provision. Later that year, in a speech to the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution, Pakington declared that sectarianism remained the basic reason for the failure to achieve national education in England. (1) The Report of the Newcastle Commission, which itself recommended rating, supplied some interesting information on the financial support given under the voluntary system. Pakington referred to the investigations of Fraser, one of the assistant commissioners. "He selected a district with 168 schools, and it appeared that 169 clergymen contributed £1,782, or £10 10s. each; 399 landowners contributed £2,127, or £5 6s. each; 217 occupiers contributed £200, or 18s. 6d. each; 102 householders contributed £181, or £1 15s. 6d. each; 141 other persons contributed £228. It therefore appeared that the clergyman contributed eleven times as much as the farmer, six times as much as the householder, and, though with probably not half his income, twice as much as the squire." (2)

In 1867 one of Pakington's keenest opponents, Edward Baines, announced the capitulation of extreme voluntaryism; "The school committees and teachers became disheartened, the subscriptions declined; in short, the purely voluntary system, which had done such immense service in former years was obviously overmatched and undermined." (3) Just as the schools of the Congregationalists were undermined by those of the grant-aided communions, so in their turn would

---

(1) The Times, 1 November 1862.
(2) Hansard, CLXIV, 704, 11 July 1861. On this point see J.S. Hurt, 'Landowners, Farmers, and Clergy and the Financing of Rural Education before 1870', Journal of Educational Administration and History, I (1), 1968.
(3) E. Baines, Address as Chairman of a Breakfast of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, delivered in Manchester on 11 October 1867, and quoted in S.E. Maltby, Manchester and the Movement for National Elementary Education 1800-1870 (1918), 102.

grant-aided schools be overmatched by those of the school boards. (1) Pakington sought to minimise the effect of such changes by requiring the daily reading of the Bible in all schools, thus ensuring that Christian education was guaranteed by statute.

Pakington's basic solution to the problem of neglected districts was, where proved deficiency existed, to establish education boards with power to levy a rate. "The want of adequate and constant funds" to which H.M.I. Kennedy referred in his report for 1850, (2) could only be supplied, in Pakington's opinion, by an education rate. He declared this firmly to Derby in 1853 (3) when he argued that if a rate were to "paralyze voluntary exertions", it would prove that such voluntary exertions were insufficient. Pakington, however, spoke cautiously enough in the Commons on this issue in 1854 in his speech on the Manchester and Salford Education Bill. "And he had himself, therefore, come to the conclusion, though reluctantly and with hesitation, that, at least in the case of the populous districts of England, resort must be had to an educational rate." (4) He sought to show on that occasion that in the U.S.A. the existence of an education rate had not ended voluntary effort, that in England the existence of a poor rate had not supplanted

---

(1) This danger was clearly foreseen, and in 1870 there was strong resistance in Anglican circles to the principle of school boards. See for example the report of the Education Committee of the Convocation of York. Convocation of York, Report to Convocation of the Committee of Education (1870). The Committee, which included Close and Richson, had been appointed to examine the Education Bills of 1868 and any subsequent proposals. It reported in January 1870.

(2) See E. Girdlestone, The Education Question (1852), 6, which quotes from the report, and 13, where Girdlestone refers to diocesan boards as "men in buckram".

(3) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 28 October 1853.

(4) Hansard, CXXX, 1077, 21 February 1854.

private charity, and finally that an education rate would be fundamentally different from the unpopular church rate inasmuch as it would not be applied for the exclusive benefit of one religious communion. Pakington's advocacy of an education rate was to be accompanied by the scheme of religious toleration afforded at King Edward's School, Birmingham, indeed it was Prince Lee, the former headmaster, who asked Pakington to take charge of the Manchester and Salford measure. But should toleration of all believers, including Catholics, Swedenborgians, Jews, Quakers, Irvingites and Plymouth Brethren, as at Birmingham, be extended to unbelievers? Should secular education be established upon the rates? The Times [1] in a leader on the Manchester and Salford Bill advised that a compulsory rate would be of little value without compulsory attendance, and that as the latter was unacceptable to an Englishman's personal liberty there was little point in the scheme.

Pakington's Bill of 1855 proposed elected education boards with powers to levy a rate and establish new schools. It provoked a storm of opposition in which Close, Colquhoun, Denison and Henley were to the fore. Richard Burgess posed an alternative when he called for increased funds, which would be applied not only in assistance of existing institutions, but also to supply new schools "entirely out of the public money" to be put at the disposal of the Committee of Council. Burgess rejected the doctrine that "to adhere to any particular creed is the sign of a narrow mind," [2] but his own solution would surely have raised problems of religion and control similar to those posed by rate-supported schools. Pakington believed in

---

(1) The Times, 22 February 1854.
(2) R. Burgess, National Education, by Rates or Taxes (1855), 11-13.

local knowledge, local effort and local control, (1) as a necessary counter to central government extravagance and ignorance, but he saw also the value of some central finance and inspection. (2) Thus in 1855 he proposed, "that where the locality is called upon to provide a certain amount by rate, the public fund of the country shall contribute a fixed proportionate amount," (3) and "that these local boards ... shall be superintended by a central department, duly representing and responsible to this House ... ." (4)

The first of the resolutions agreed to by Pakington and the Manchester educationists on 19 November 1856 declared "That a Rate for Education is desirable", and the Bill of 1857 proposed elected school committees with the power to levy rates. In the proposed resolutions of April 1862, however, when Pakington suggested district boards to assist in the distribution of the central grant and to promote the union of small parishes for the foundation and support of a common school, he refrained from any specific mention of an education rate. Indeed he even hesitated on whether the boards should be empowered to encourage and regulate local subscriptions. (5) The resolutions, however, were a tactical manoeuvre. Pakington remained convinced of the need for elements of local control and finance in national education, and

---

(1) Pakington's faith in the ability of local worthies contrasted strongly with Close who expressed "profound surprise" that Pakington "should agree to entrust the education of the people to such a class of persons as rate-payers usually elect for the management of local affairs." F. Close, The Spirit of the Debate in the House of Commons, on education, on the nights of the 10th and 11th of April 1856 and the probable practical results (1856), 25.

(2) This would be particularly necessary in very poor areas.

(3) Hansard, CXXXVII, 661, 16 March 1855.

(4) Hansard, CXXXVII, 2114, 2 May 1855.

(5) This was later confirmed. Hansard, CLXXVII, 924-5, 28 February 1865.

he reaffirmed this viewpoint in his speech at the formal opening of the Worcester Board Schools. (1) Whether he would have approved of the eventual demise of the school boards is uncertain. Certainly in 1862 he queried the conclusion of the Newcastle Commissioners. "They recommend the constitution of county boards. I recommend boards acting for smaller districts ... ." (2)

Pakington's championship of local agency was reinforced by his distrust of the Committee of Council. He objected both to its mode of operation and to its constitution. Money was given in aid of wealthy districts rather than to those most in need, whilst the Committee itself was an anomalous body. Pakington's assault on this system culminated in his Select Committee of 1865, and in 1870 it was for Pakington a matter of much regret that though local agencies had been created, and though Forster himself would succeed to the Cabinet, no Ministry of Education had been established. Pakington believed that only a Ministry of Education could give sufficient status to the cause of national education, and bring the system under proper parliamentary control. His work as a Cabinet minister convinced him of the importance of such a reform, just as his personal role in the locality of Worcester convinced him of the need for local education boards. He saw the two as complementary elements in a national system, each in its own way operating as a useful aid to, and check upon, the other. Pakington's parliamentary campaign for the abolition of the Committee of Privy Council and its replacement by a ministry of Cabinet rank was an unswerving one which began in the Commons in 1855, (3) and continued throughout his career in that House. In May 1874, at the

---

(1) The Times, 8 September 1873.
(2) Hansard, CLXVI, 1233, 5 May 1862. Pakington would, however, probably have approved of Higher Grade Schools.
(3) Hansard, CXXXVII, 644-5, 16 March 1855.

first opportunity in the Lords, he moved a resolution "... that the Committee of Council on Education should be superseded by the appointment of a Minister of Public Instruction ... ." (1) Pakington was defeated on that occasion, for in spite of the Bill of 1868 Richmond, on behalf of the new Conservative Government, was now prepared to argue that the state could leave education in the hands of the religious organizations and the new local bodies, and that the necessity for a more powerful central authority had been diminished by the Act of 1870.

Pakington was less successful in this field of central government reform, but he could claim to be the author of the legislation of 1856, and the progenitor of the resolution of 1864 on inspectors' reports, which both strengthened parliamentary control over education. (2) Moreover he contributed to a widening of the scope of the Privy Council grants, and to a more satisfactory parliamentary presentation of the Minutes themselves. It is notable that Pakington fought on on these issues when others faltered. Russell for example, in 1862, simply abandoned his attendance at meetings of the Committee of Council. He complained to Granville that the Revised Code had been introduced without any meeting of, or sanction by the Committee. (3) Russell concluded, "Indeed it is doubtful to me whether the authority established in 1839 was not entirely subverted by the Code of 1860, and that of 1861 which gave to the President and Vice-President of the Council the superintendence of all sums voted by Parliament

---

(1) Hansard, CCXIX, 688, 22 May 1874.
(2) Indeed one of Pakington's most eloquent pleas on behalf of a Ministry of Education was made in the aftermath of the inspectors' reports issue. Hansard, CLXXV, 371-82, 12 May 1864.
(3) A meeting which took place before the opening of the Session comprised all members of the Cabinet who chose to come.

for the education of the labouring classes." (1)

Pakington sought to give more powers and resources to those who worked for the establishment of education. He wanted government grants disbursed to a wider range of schools, including those for the very poor, he wanted rate-supported schools and education boards, he wanted the Committee of Privy Council transformed into a Ministry of Public Instruction. He seemed at times to be blissfully unaware of the potential conflict which such expansion might entail. Rate-aided education was accompanied by the decline of denominational schooling and the spread of secularism. Was Pakington's campaign in 1870 for the daily reading of the Bible an expression of a consistent Christian commitment or the belated recognition of the contradictions in his policies? Pakington never seemed to examine closely the full implications of the fact that the state would have a different set of priorities from the church. Thus he regretted the abandonment of Royal Letters, "... it appeared to be an abandonment by the Government of the country of what he held to be a sacred and national duty. But the generosity of the English public had compensated for the deficiency of the Government." (2)

Pakington looked forward from conflict to harmony in education. As he told the first annual meeting of the Church Education Society, "there is ample room for the exertions of all," and so indeed he believed. In 1856 in Manchester, and in his 1857 Bill he took deliberate steps to conciliate rival groups, whilst in Parliament itself he won leading political opponents, Russell, Bruce,

---

(1) Granville Mss. P.R.O. 30/29/18/6/93-6, Russell to Granville, 26 March 1862.
(2) Speech at Hereford to the annual meeting of the Diocesan Societies, The Times, 15 October 1873.

Forster, even Gladstone, over to his educational schemes.

In 1857 Thomas Wrigley wrote "That it is no part of the duty of the State to PROVIDE Education for the people, any more than it is to feed and clothe them." (1) Pakington believed that it was the state's duty ultimately to provide education for its people, and in October 1871 in his speech at Leeds to the N.A.P.S.S. he appeared to many to say that it was the state's duty ultimately to ensure that its people were fed and housed. Pakington subsequently denied that he had called upon Parliament "to provide the working classes of this country with better food and better dwellings", (2) rather did he hope that legislation to facilitate these objects would be forthcoming. It was a nice distinction, however; some would term it confusion. Similarly, in the control of education, Pakington's concept of co-operation under state control seemed to many to be but a sure recipe for ultimate conflict. Pakington appeared to sacrifice too many principles in his search for a national system. Thus Baines commented on the Bill of 1857, "This is another of those well-meant but injudicious projects, ... the fruit of a compromise between the friends of secular education and religious education at Manchester, under the skilful mediation of Sir John Pakington; but, like many other compromises, it rather disguises than removes difficulties ... ." (3) One might question several of Baines' ten specific criticisms of the Bill, and indeed

---

(1) T.Wrigley, A Plan by which the education of the people may be secured without state interference (1857), 35. He went on, 49-51, to approve of the letter of 'A Nottinghamshire Clergyman'.
(2) Hansard, CCX, 1209, 12 April 1872.
(3) E. Baines, Strictures on Sir John Pakington's Borough Bill, as appended to W.J. Unwin, Voluntary and Religious Education ... (1857).

ten years later Baines announced his conversion from extreme voluntaryism to the need for partnership between state and sect. (1) Nevertheless in the longer term it might be argued that Baines, Colquhoun, Close and Denison were right, and Pakington wrong, in their belief that rate-aided education and local boards would drive out the schools of the religious societies, and that the education provided under the new aegis would be fundamentally secular in tone.

One of the most distinctive elements in Pakington's concept of national education was his conviction that different social classes should, particularly in the early years, be united in the same schoolroom. In 1855 he cited the example of Philadelphia where free schools of good quality had greatly reduced the demand for private schooling. In 1835 the free schools had contained less than 10,000 scholars, and the majority of wealthier citizens sent their children to private schools. "A change then took place, these schools were placed on a different footing, and instead of remaining inferior became superior schools; the elementary education given was good, the masters were not masters who could just write their names, but were fit for their occupation, and the effect of the reform was, that in Philadelphia private schools were almost superseded, and, instead of there being only 9,346 scholars at the free schools, there were, in 1845, only ten years after the change, 36,665, and in 1852, 49,630. The most complete success attended the experiment, and

---

(1) J.R. Lowerson, 'The political career of Sir Edward Baines, 1800-1890', Leeds University M.A. thesis, 1965, 5, concludes; "Intransigent zealots like Baines actually held back, albeit unwittingly, the improvement they sought to promote. Only when they gave up could the work of mass education get under weigh."

the great bulk of the children of all classes met, as they ought to do, and received their education in common at the free school." (1) Pakington also adduced examples from England itself in support of his Bill. He thus commended Kings Somborne for its success in "the mixing of the children of the farmers and of the labourers for the purpose of receiving an elementary education. There were at this school 152 children of labourers and seventy children of farmers and tradesmen. This was a subject on which he felt deeply ... He saw no reason why the children of farmers and tradesmen, and those of labourers, should not be educated together for elementary education." (2) Pakington's approach to schooling had many comprehensive dimensions. Though his Bill of 1857 was concerned principally with cities and boroughs he saw it as a first step only, and believed that all districts of the country which needed locally organized aid should receive it. On 30 June 1864 he protested against the distinction made between grants to endowed schools in country and towns by the Minute of 11 March 1864, and on the same evening in the Supply debate drew attention to the plight of "neglected districts" which received no aid from central grants. (3) In the Athenaeum speech in 1856 Pakington declared "that every man whose means were less than £100 a year must look to a cheap and good education for his children as among, not the secondary, but the primary necessaries of life. ("Hear, hear," and applause.) The

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 663, 16 March 1855. This statement shows not only Pakington's concern for good quality teaching and schools, but also his inconsistency on the issue of the probable effects of free schooling.
(2) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1822, 11 June 1855.
(3) Hansard, CLXXVI, 547, 30 June 1864.

question was not, then, limited merely to labouring men. (Hear, hear.) The tradesman and the farmer, as a rule, in matters of education, paid dearly for a bad article, and if every existing school in England was what it ought to be, instead of being exactly the reverse, there ought to be in every town and village schools in which the children of the small tradesman or farmer, in common with the children of the labourer, might receive the blessings of elementary instruction. (Applause.) It was so in other countries; why should it not be so in England?" (1) By 1862 Pakington had widened his concept of social mixture to include all classes and age ranges. In his presidential address to the Birmingham and Midland Institute Pakington declared that the Institute itself was not simply a Mechanics' Institute. "It is essentially a people's college ... This college welcomes and teaches the artisan, but it aims at higher educational purposes, and it offers education such as it seems to me the middle, and indeed, the upper classes of this great city might, with advantage to themselves accept. (Applause.) Liberal and free as are Englishmen and English institutions, we are an aristocratic people, and I have often heard it said that our different social classes will never consent to learn together in the same schoolroom. I believe this to be erroneous both in feeling and fact. In other countries the children of the gentleman, the tradesman, and the peasant are taught their rudiments by the same teacher, and I believe it to be for the good of all that it should be so ... I hope the day is not distant when we may see different classes mingling to a considerable extent, not only in the primary school, but in the secondary college, and this admirable institute seems to invite the introduction of such a system." (2)

---

(1) The Times, 20 November 1856.
(2) The Times, 1 October 1862.

Pakington's evidence to the Taunton Commission [1] concluded that the solution to the problems of middle-class education, especially of the lower stratum, lay "in an improved and extended system of National schools."[2] He replied to Lord Taunton's specific question "From your experience are you of opinion that there is a decided advantage in boys of different classes mixing on the same benches in the same school? - I really can hardly say that I have any experience of my own to justify me in expressing an opinion, but speaking on general grounds I certainly should be glad to see it. I see no objection to it at all. I am fortified in that opinion, as this Commission must be aware, by long standing experience in Scotland." [3] Pakington did not believe that all children needed to receive the same education. But he did approve of schools like Kings Somborne, or that at Chalfont in Buckinghamshire where children were grouped not according to social position but according to their subjects of study. [4]

Pakington's presidential address to the N.A.P.S.S. in 1871 and his part in the New Social Movement show that his concern for social mixture was not confined to the classroom. For him national education was not merely to reflect the two, or more, nations of nineteenth-century England, but rather to be one means of greater social cohesion. As Pakington said at Leeds in 1872. "He thought the less they had in educational matters of class distinctions

---

(1) Evidence given on 14 June 1865. Questions and Answers, 7013 to 7081.
(2) A. 7079.
(3) Q. and A. 7023.
(4) Though the two issues were not unconnected, A. 7016. See also on this point the evidence of Reverend Charles Lloyd, the incumbent of Chalfont, to Pakington's Select Committee on 13 June 1865.

the better for the welfare of the country. (Loud applause.) He did not like class in these matters (hear, hear.); they were aware that Englishmen had to learn a good deal in these educational matters from their neighbours across the Tweed. What had they found in Scotland during the last two centuries - the son of the merchant and of the working man deriving each education from the same source and from the same teacher. There were no class distinctions there, and why should there be class distinctions here? (Applause.)" (1)

In his estimates of numbers of children who should be at school and the duration of school life, Pakington employed two major criteria. The first was the one in six rule, which he attributed to the U.S.A., (2) and the second the practice of such countries as Denmark and Prussia of requiring the school attendance of all children between the ages of seven and fourteen. (3) Keith Johnston's figures, which Pakington quoted in the Commons in 1858, showed that only 45% of the children in England in this age range were in school. Pakington admitted in 1855 that a more typical school life for the children of the English working classes might be from five to twelve, but within that span he was quite unwilling, as Horace Mann had done in 1851, to make any deduction for children to be at work. (4) Pakington sought to extend the school life

---

(1) The Times, 8 October 1872. Speech to the Leeds Schools of Art and Science.
(2) Hansard, CXXXIV, 964, 30 June 1854. In some parts of the U.S.A., notably in New York State, the percentage was reckoned as one in five.
(3) Hansard, CXXXVII, 651, 16 March 1855. In other German states, for example Bavaria, there was compulsory schooling from six to fourteen.
(4) Hansard, CXXXVII, 648-9, 16 March 1855.

to run from five to fourteen years, and he was thus particularly concerned by the statistics which showed that the proportion of older children in schools was diminishing rather than increasing.

Pakington believed that school was a better place for children than work or the streets. He was fully alive to the problems of those children who had no place of recreation at a time when there were severe penalties for playing games on public thoroughfares. (1) Though he was aware of the financial burdens of many parents he maintained that children had a right to childhood and that good schools were the best means of guaranteeing that right. He believed too that all children deserved equal attention, not only those who could gain the best grants for the school. One of Pakington's main objections to the Revised Code was that payment by results would be "a direct inducement to the managers of our poorest and humbler schools to neglect the education of the very children that require the most care ... I say the dullest children require the most care, and they are those who will fail on the day of the examination." (2)

One compromise solution canvassed by Pakington in the later 1850's to the problem of early school leavers was an extension of the half-time system. In his opening address to the Education conference of June 1857 which was particularly concerned with this problem, Prince Albert referred to the fact that of two million children attending school only some 600,000 were above the age of nine. (3) Pakington, who attended the study group specifically

---

(1) Those convicted of playing games in the streets were liable to a fine of 40/- or imprisonment of up to one month. Forty-four children were sent to prison in London in 1859 for such offences.
(2) Hansard, CLXVI, 213, 27 March 1862.
(3) The Times, 23 June 1857.

concerned with "the irregularity and insufficiency of the time of school attendance", [1] on the next day declared that "The very greatest evil under which the cause of education suffered was the early removal of children from school," [2] and suggested that the extension of the half-time system to the whole of England would be one means of ensuring that the rights of children were respected. Pakington would have preferred compulsory full-time education to fourteen, but he considered that a properly regulated half-time system would be a step in that direction. He concluded moreover that the main reason for the early withdrawal was not that children were needed for work but that many schools had so little to offer that neither parents nor children could see much point in further attendance. He accordingly was concerned to ensure that schools offered a broad and meaningful curriculum.

In 1854 J.G. Fitch outlined the basic subjects to be taught in the elementary school.[3] Reading and Writing

---

(1) The Times, 24 June 1857.

(2) The Times, 25 June 1857. There is a useful summary in The Educational Conference: its probable results: being a digest of the proceedings on June 22nd and 24th ... (1857). This report, published anonymously, but compiled by M.A. Baines, was particularly complimentary towards Pakington and spoke of his "matured thought", "deliberate judgement" and "indefatigable zeal" in the cause of national education. Granville presided on the last day of the conference and other speakers included, Akroyd, Baines, Brougham, Cowper, Kay-Shuttleworth, Lansdowne, Samuel Morley and Wilberforce. See also,A. Hill (ed.), Essays upon educational subjects, read at the educational conference of June 1857. With a short account of the objects and proceedings of the meeting (1857).

(3) J.G. Fitch, The Relative Importance of Subjects Taught in Elementary Schools (1854). Fitch was at this time Vice-Principal of Borough Road College. He subsequently became an H.M.I. and wrote numerous pamphlets including Public Education. Why is a New Code Wanted? (1861), The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the State of Middle-Class Education (1865), and Memorandum on the Working of the Free School System in America, France and Belgium (1891),. There is a sympathetic account of his work and influence in A. Robertson. 'J.G. Fitch and the Origins of the Liberal Movement in Education, 1863-70', Journal of Educational Administration and History, III (2), 1971.

he placed first, followed by Arithmetic, English Grammar, Geography and History. Supplementary subjects were Music, Drawing and Common Things (Science). Religious Instruction he considered of such importance as to be in a separate category from the rest. Pakington, when introducing his Bill of 1855, quoted from Mann's report which showed that in England and Wales, whilst 98% of schools taught Reading, only 68% taught Writing, 61% Arithmetic, and 44% English Grammar. Industrial occupation, which in Pakington's view was one of the prime purposes of education, was taught by only 2%. He contrasted this with the elementary schools of Denmark, France, Prussia and Switzerland in which full curricula were established by law. (1)

Accordingly Pakington's Bills of 1855 and 1857 both included sections on school curricula. The latter, for example, prescribed for children aged seven and upwards a general course of instruction which should include Reading, Writing, English Grammar, Arithmetic, Geography and English History, with Book-keeping for the boys and Needlework for the girls. Upon such a basis could be built the studies of more mature years, studies which Pakington warmly commended in the curriculum of the Birmingham and Midland Institute. "When I see that, after your periodical examinations, certificates have been granted to very many candidates for competent knowledge of one or more of the subjects of chymical physics,elementary chymistry, analytical chymistry, English history and literature, the French and German languages, English grammar and composition, geometry, algebra, and advanced arithmetic, I cannot refrain from comparing such a course of study with the teaching given by our great public schools to the sons of the highest and wealthiest citizens of the State." (2) Pakington, indeed,

---

(1) For example, in France by Guizot's statute of 25 April 1834. Hansard, CXXXVII, 650-2, 16 March 1855.
(2) The Times, 1 October 1862.

regretted the continuing dominance of classics in the public and grammar schools. When Lord Taunton asked him whether Greek and Latin should be provided as staple fare in the grammar and other schools of the middle classes, Pakington replied that only the study of Latin should be actively encouraged therein, and that whilst it was desirable to give children "the opportunity of learning the dead languages, if their parents wish it," even Latin should be optional from the beginning. Mathematics, Pakington considered fundamental, and physical science "very desirable". Though there had been some changes in grammar school curricula by the 1860's, Pakington advised Taunton that "in other cases the whole thing wants reformation." (1)

Pakington's broad appreciation of life was reflected in his desire for a broad curriculum within all schools, institutes and colleges. All children should receive a basic grounding in the full range of elementary school subjects, and then higher studies, whether classics, philosophy, politics, technology, sciences or arts, should be available to those who could benefit from such study. Pakington's particular emphasis upon scientific and technical education was not a narrow or exclusive emphasis, it was a reflection of his appreciation of the new wealth of the country, of the complex demands of such industrial and commercial cities as Birmingham and Manchester, of the need to redress a balance which had for too long been over-weighted in favour of classical studies for the rich and obedience and reading for the poor. (2) He saw the

---

(1) A. 7050, 7061-71.
(2) Pakington was a long-serving member of the Parliamentary Committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, though he had "a discreditable attendance record". David Layton, 'The educational work of the Parliamentary Committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science', History of Education, V (1), 1976, 29.

reform of the elementary schools and the introduction of mechanics' and other types of institutes not only as worthwhile ends in themselves, but also as a means of reforming the curricula of other educational institutions, including the grammar and public schools. Pakington, as he said in his speech at Leeds in 1872, "had always been a very warm and earnest advocate of Mechanics' Institutes,"(1) he had also approved of their extension into the general areas of science and art, and of the spread of such studies among the middle and upper classes. Whilst Pakington recognized the need for ultimate specialization and division of labour in education, as in other spheres of life, he also sought, through curriculum extension and reform, to afford a basic common core of educational experience to the whole of the nation.

A broad appreciation of life, a broad curriculum, culminated in Pakington's broad churchmanship. There can be no doubting his sincere Christian commitment. Like Fitch he saw religious and spiritual instruction as being of such importance as to occupy a distinct and superior place in all education. In 1872, for example, when presiding at the annual midsummer examination of the scholars of the Commercial Travellers School at Pinner, Pakington expressed his approval that the education there provided was religious in tone, and that this subject had been examined first. But upon what grounds should such primacy be based and assured? Baines and Denison alike believed that control of schools by religious bodies was the only real safeguard. Archdeacon John Sinclair, treasurer of the National Society, and treasurer of the Education conference of June 1857, concluded that the whole vitality of the school system depended upon "the stimulus of religion",(2)

---

(1) The Times, 8 October 1872.
(2) J. Sinclair, Remarks on School Rates in England and America (5th ed., 1867), 30.

that there was no such stimulus in the common school of the U.S.A., and that proposals for rate aid should therefore be strongly resisted. Many thus saw Pakington's plans to broaden the curriculum of the elementary school as a dangerous extension of his plans to broaden the basis of educational finance and control.

Pakington's broad aim, to ensure that national education included a central religious component, was a constant one, but his methods for achieving this end were not consistent. Though a Churchman, Pakington was ever conscious of the role which Dissent had played in English society. He recognized "the inadequacy of the Church to meet the religious requirements of the people,"(1) and that Anglicans were "deeply indebted to our Dissenting brethren," (2) for filling up the religious and educational gaps, especially in the towns. He also approved of the principle which operated in District Pauper Schools whereby representatives of the various congregations were permitted to enter schools to impart religious instruction. (3) But should such toleration extend to those who did not want their children to receive religious instruction inside the school but rather in the church, or even to receive no religious instruction at all?

In 1854, in a speech on the Manchester and Salford Education Bill, Pakington declared that national education should be universal, and religious, and that the religious teaching should be conducted upon the fairest and most tolerant principles. As an example he cited King Edward's

---

(1) Hansard, CLII, 1585, 9 March 1859, speech on the Church Rates Bill.
(2) Hansard, CLIX, 1730, 11 July 1860, speech on the Census Bill.
(3) Pakington also supported this principle in relation to prisons. See his speech on the Prison Ministers Bill, Hansard, CLXX, 1328, 7 May 1863.

School, Birmingham, where "the religious lessons were given first in the day, and any parent who objected to the particular religious instruction that was then given had the liberty of keeping the child at home until that part of the education was concluded." (1) Pakington believed that where children did not attend religious lessons, parents must be relied upon to arrange alternative instruction. The Church of England Society, founded to promote scriptural education amongst the poorer classes, secured Pakington's support precisely because it did not, like the National Society, require the teaching of the Catechism to every scholar, but was willing "to give our religious teaching in a milder and more tolerant spirit than has hitherto prevailed in this country." (2)

In 1855, however, in framing his own Education Bill, Pakington failed to find a solution to the religious problem. He proposed that schools of all religious denominations recognized by the Committee of Council should be equally entitled to rate aid, that no child should be excluded on religious grounds, and that no creed or catechism should be forced upon any child. Schools founded under the Act would be Church of England schools, unless the majority of the population in a particular district were of another denomination, when the Committee of Council could determine that the religious teaching should be in accordance with the wishes of that majority. The National Society in its annual report for 1855 characterized Pakington's Bill as an impediment to the progress of religious education, and in the Commons protests were made that there was no requirement for the daily reading of the scriptures, nor any guarantee that secular schools

---

(1) Hansard, CXXX, 1081, 21 February 1854.
(2) First Annual Report of the Church of England Education Society (1854), 34-5. Pakington's speech to the annual meeting held on 25 April 1854.

would not be maintained under the Bill. Pakington argued that he had thought such provisions unnecessary because "the Bill rests upon what is commonly called the denominational system," but he offered to introduce clauses in Committee to "guard against the apprehended danger." (1) Bright wrote from the Reform Club of the necessity "to give up any legislation on the religious question," (2) but Cobden, though advising that rates should be devoted to secular instruction only and not to denominational religious teaching, included "in the term "secular" all that religious instruction which is common to all sects, and which in 99-100ths of our English parishes would I believe embrace the authorized version of the Bible." (3)

In 1856 Pakington at Manchester so far abandoned his principles as to agree "That all Schools shall be entitled to aid out of the Rate, provided the Instruction, other than Religious, shall come up to a required standard, and that no child shall be excluded on Religious grounds." (4) Though Pakington claimed to Derby that the secular system was abandoned by this compromise, he had to admit that the secular principle was not. (5) True it had been accepted that a purely secular system was impossible, (6) but as Pakington acknowledged, under the 1857 Bill secular schools could be maintained on the rates, there was no specific provision for daily Bible reading, and where rate aid was

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVII, 2115, 2 May 1855.
(2) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(ii)/M/P/58, Bright to Pakington, 1 February 1855.
(3) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 8-10, Cobden to Pakington, 13 January 1855.
(4) The third of the resolutions agreed at Manchester on 19 November 1856.
(5) Derby Mss. Box 141/9, Pakington to Derby, 23 and 26 January 1857.
(6) Cobden Mss. B.L. Add. Mss. 43669, 72-3, Smiles to Cobden, 20 December 1856.

given to denominational schools it "should not be directly applied to doctrinal religious teaching." (1) He had come to understand that the aim of the secular party was not secular education for a secular society, but a solution to the religious difficulty which would allow religious instruction to be imparted to a section of the nation not inside, but outside, the classroom. Pakington retreated from this position slightly after 1857, and concentrated instead upon the more particular goal of a universal conscience clause. "Religious toleration and forbearance in consideration of the views of others," (2) however, was still his basic theme, a theme repeated after 1870 when he deplored the harm done to education by "that narrow and intolerant spirit which is too often the result of excessive zeal and of implicit faith in the correctness of our own opinions." (3)

But in 1870 the amendment which Pakington urged upon Forster's Bill was precisely that which had been urged upon his own Bills of 1855 and 1857. True this was against the background of the Cowper-Temple clause, of which Pakington in general approved, but he also argued "that if you adopt the negative proposition to reject the formularies and the catechisms you ought to adopt the positive proposition that the Bible should be read." (4) Pakington sought to give religious education in the new schools some definite base and substance, his unsuccessful amendment of 30 June proposed that "The Holy Scriptures

---

(1) Hansard, CXLIV, 781, 18 February 1857. A nice distinction for which Pakington was taken to task by Russell.
(2) Speech to the Droitwich Mechanics' Institute, The Times, 7 January 1868.
(3) Presidential address to the N.A.P.S.S. at Leeds, The Times, 5 October 1871.
(4) Hansard, CCII, 572, 20 June 1870.

shall form part of the daily reading and teaching ... ."[1] In 1876 in a speech in the Lords on the Conservative Elementary Education Bill he concluded that "The country generally was in favour of the Act of 1870, with the exception of its inadequate provisions on the subject of religious education." [2] Pakington reported on that occasion that of 284 school boards, 167 had required the teaching of religion, sixty-two permitted the reading of the Bible without note or comment, sixteen prohibited the reading of the Bible, and thirty-nine forbade all religious observance or instruction. [3] He himself would never be satisfied "as long as it was in the power of any set of men to deny to the children of the humbler classes the benefits of religious education," [4] and till the end of his life he continued to champion the cause of a compulsory religious element in the curriculum.

Whilst Pakington was totally convinced of the need for religious education, he approached more warily two other elements in his concept of national education, that schooling should both, where necessary, be provided free of charge, and should also ultimately be made compulsory. In his Bill of 1855 Pakington provided that new schools established by the local boards with rate support should be free schools, and that existing schools coming into union with the board could under its direction admit free scholars. Haly, in drawing up the Bill, expressed some concern that this would unnecessarily further antagonize supporters of the voluntary schools, [5] but Pakington

---

(1) Hansard, CCII, 1265, 30 June 1870.
(2) Hansard, CCXXXI, 810, 8 August 1876.
(3) These statistics were collected by the National Society.
(4) Ibid., 812.
(5) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(ii)/M/P/46, Haly to Pakington, 11 January 1855.

had consulted Bentinck about the free schools of Holland,[1] and in introducing his Bill into the Commons referred with approval to the free schools of Austria, Holland and the U.S.A.[2] He argued that though free education was, in England, connected in the public mind with pauperism and charity, under a proper national system, financed through taxes and rates, free education would become a natural right. A year later, however, in a speech on Russell's resolutions, Pakington conceded that on the issue of free schools, "I have always admitted that much may be said on both sides. I do not think, however, that the establishment of free schools is essential either to the plan I myself proposed, or to any other plan suggested in these Resolutions ... ."[3]

In 1856 Pakington made himself master of the Committee of Council returns which showed that of 500,000 children attending inspected schools 35% paid only 1d. per week for their schooling, 40% 2d., and the remainder 3d. or more.[4] Since a good education cost at least 6d. a week, in his 1857 Bill Pakington engaged in a complicated formula which admitted into union free schools, schools charging fees, and schools which combined both free and fee-paying places. The school committees would make payments to school managers on various scales with a maximum of 6d. per week for each boy above seven years of age. In introducing the Bill in the Commons Pakington admitted that "I should myself

---

(1) Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(ii)/M/P/52, Bentinck to Pakington, 23 January 1855.
(2) Hansard, CXXXVII, 662-3, 16 March 1855.
(3) Hansard, CXL, 1997, 6 March 1856. J.C. Miller, rector of St. Martin's, Birmingham, referred to Pakington's proposals for free education as "an entire and total mistake". Second Annual Report of the Church of England Education Society (1855), 50.
(4) Pakington quoted these figures in his speech at the Manchester Athenaeum.

prefer a free system to be adopted throughout the whole country, but at present, at all events, the country is not prepared for that; and I think that unless a general free system could be adopted, it is better not to adopt it in part." (1) In 1870 Pakington further conceded that as a matter of policy "it would, I think, be folly to throw away the half million of money which the pence of the school children produce, while, as a question of morality, it is unquestionably desirable that the parents should be first to make a contribution towards the education of their children." (2)

Pakington appeared, on occasion, to be equally equivocal on the issue of compulsion. His basic belief was that compulsory attendance was impossible until an adequate supply of good schools was in existence, and when that happened, the obvious advantages of worthwhile education might make direct compulsion unnecessary. Pakington was not opposed in principle to compulsion in social matters. For example, in 1853 he supported the Vaccination Extension Bill introduced by Lyttelton, on the grounds that "The voluntary system had been found insufficient as a preventive of small-pox." (3) His own Bill of 1855, however, eschewed compulsion, though Pakington reported to the Commons in June that of the many letters he had received about the proposed measure, the majority had asked him to enforce the attendance of children at school, and further had sought to make the operation of the Bill compulsory rather than permissive. (4) Pakington thought that the latter issue would more appropriately be dealt

---

(1) Hansard, CXLIV, 783, 18 February 1857.
(2) Hansard, CXCIX, 487, 17 February 1870.
(3) Hansard, CXXIX, 470-2, 20 July 1853.
(4) See, for example, Hampton Mss. W.R.O. 705.349. B.A. 4732/1/(11)/M/P/56, Gilly to Pakington, 25 January 1855.

with by a government bill, on the former, compulsory attendance, he concluded "that it would be manifestly premature to attempt anything of the sort until there were more schools to go to, and until the schools were better worth attending. He believed it would be impossible for the present to pass any measure for a compulsory attendance of children ... ." (1) Pakington took up this issue in a letter which he wrote to The Times in answer to 'A Nottinghamshire Clergyman'. He concluded "that good schools must be everywhere established before attendance at them can by law be everywhere compelled." (2) But the Midland divine had several supporters, including Thomas Wrigley, who argued strongly "that Education must be made in some way compulsory; secondly, that there is no need for hesitation on the ground of want of school accommodation." (3) Pakington's own supporters, however, included Stanley, who had written to Wrigley that compulsion was impossible "until schools are placed within the reach of the whole population; nor even then, if the present connection of schools with particular sects continues ... ." (4)

In his presidential address to the Education section of the N.A.P.S.S. in 1857, Pakington declared that the time was not ripe for compulsory legislation, "either the compulsory establishment of schools, or the compulsory attendance of children," (5) but in 1871 as President of the Association he declared his belief that although

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1820, 11 June 1855.
(2) The Times, 18 March 1856.
(3) T. Wrigley, A Plan by which the education of the people may be secured ... (1857), 49.
(4) Stanley to Wrigley, 18 July 1855 . Printed in T. Wrigley, A Plan by which the education of the people may be secured ... (1857), 70-2.
(5) The Times, 14 October 1857.

difficulties still surrounded the issue of compulsion he now considered it "indispensable that the attempt should be made." (1) Pakington did not mean the compulsory adoption of school boards throughout the country, but rather that there were a minority of children who would not go willingly to school, and that "it was important that compulsion should be applied to that minority." (2)

Compulsion was, for Pakington, made possible by the Forster Act. In 1870 Pakington concluded, not without some misgivings, that compulsion was henceforth both possible and necessary; "I do not believe that without compulsion we can have anything like a satisfactory national system that will bring, as it ought to do, education to the door of every citizen of this country, however humble." (3) Compulsion under the 1870 Act, however was both optional and at times ineffective, and in 1874 in the Lords Pakington pressed Richmond on whether the Government "had in contemplation any measures intended to correct the serious evil of irregular attendance." (4) Richmond gave, as he himself acknowledged, an unsatisfactory answer on this point, but Pakington did on this occasion secure the support of Lyttelton who approved the principle of compulsion, though he thought it best applied in indirect ways. Pakington concurred in this point in 1874 and two years later he still hoped that indirect compulsion would succeed, but he also declared in 1876 that "If Her Majesty's Government had decided to introduce into the Bill a provision of direct compulsion he would have been ready to support it." (5)

---

(1) The Times, 5 October 1871.
(2) Speech at the opening of the Worcester Board schools, The Times, 8 September 1873.
(3) Hansard, CXCIX, 483, 17 February 1870.
(4) Hansard, CCXX, 602, 29 June 1874.
(5) Hansard, CCXXXI, 809-10, 8 August 1876.

The most significant element in Pakington's concept of national education was his concern for the quality of schooling. He had no wish to compel children to attend schools which were unworthy of them. One means of improving the quality of schooling was through the training of teachers. Pakington played a major role in the foundation and development of the Worcester Diocesan Training School, which was ultimately opened at Saltley in 1852. But his encouragement of teachers went far beyond the matter of local supply. When in 1866 he presided at Dudley at the fifteenth annual dinner of the Church of England United Association of Schoolmasters of South Staffordshire and North Worcestershire, having declared his decided approval of the Association, of its quarterly meetings, and of its library, in which a copy of the Report of Pakington's Select Committee for 1865 had been judiciously, and no doubt prominently, displayed, Pakington went on to consider larger themes. Though he had reluctantly recently declined an invitation to preside over a society to promote the registration of schoolmasters under sanction of an act of Parliament, Pakington thoroughly approved of this plan "to place the schoolmasters of England on the same footing by Act of Parliament which medical men in this country now occupy - in fact to give them a status as it is urged; and, I must say, I think with great force and truth. It would give a new status, an increased and raised respectability of position to the schoolmasters of this country." (1)

---

(1) The Times, 8 October 1866. Pakington was fully occupied as First Lord of the Admiralty at this time. Pakington's evidence to the Taunton Commission, however, suggests that he was not in 1865 well acquainted with the work of the College of Preceptors. On that occasion he declared that "the registration of schoolmasters might be desirable". A. 7055.

Pakington did, moreover, promote in Parliament the cause of good teachers. In 1855 in the debate on the second reading of his Education Bill, having urged that those who were satisfied by the increase in the quantity of schooling should address themselves more to its quality, he drew attention to the figures in Mann's report which showed that more than 700 teachers had signed the returns with a mark. Though it had been urged that many of these were in charge of infant schools, Pakington retorted "that no person in such a state of ignorance was fit to have the charge of children, and the fact itself was proof of the unsatisfactory state of education in this country." (1) In the Supply debate of the same year he defended strongly the grant expenditure on the provision of a teaching force, and his speech foreshadowed the controversies which were to surround the training of teachers at the time of the Newcastle Commission. (2) He declared that "A large portion of the sum was very wisely devoted to the object of providing a good supply of efficient schoolmasters, without which no system of education, however skilfully contrived in other respects could prove satisfactory in its working ... the pupil teachers conferred so much benefit on the existing schools that, even if they did not afterwards take to the profession of schoolmasters, they fairly earned the whole of the money that had been expended upon them. It had been said that the schoolmasters were over-trained. Now, the true ground of complaint was not so much that the

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1811, 11 June 1855.
(2) Pakington indeed saw the dangers in providing "razors for cutting blocks", but he had no objections to "razors" themselves, he wanted rather the inclusion of some saws and chisels in the teachers' all-purpose tool boxes.

schoolmasters were educated to too high a point as that their training did not reach sufficiently low. It did not comprehend those industrial and other pursuits, a knowledge of which was so essential to those who undertook to teach in country schools." (1) Pakington was therefore most strongly opposed to the effects of the Revised Code upon teacher training in general and pupil teachers in particular, (2) and the Educational Guardian, "A journal devoted to the interests of teachers and education generally. Edited and conducted by schoolmasters", rightly saw Pakington as the teachers' champion. (3) An article entitled 'National Education' reviewed Pakington's Edinburgh speech. "... we are glad to find so excellent an authority speaking in enthusiastic terms of "the great and valuable peculiarity which distinguishes Scottish education from that of England. It forms one complete and consistent structure - the Schools and the Universities form one connected system, and the teachers of the rich and poor form one class." The advantages of this system over the inseparably divided class-system of England and Ireland are great and obvious ... .

Of the advantages the teacher would reap from the superior arrangement, Sir John thus speaks:- "It makes him a member of a distinct and honourable profession, in which, as in other professions, though the humblest places must be filled, the highest prizes are open to all, and there is, therefore that stimulus to study, which has in other pursuits, always been found sufficient." In those sentiments we heartily concur." (4)

---

(1) Hansard, CXXXIX, 1409, 26 July 1855. For an analysis of the proportion of the grants spent on teacher training see, R.E. Aldrich, 'Facts behind the Figures, 1839-1859', History of Education Society Bulletin, XIII, 1974.
(2) See, for example, Derby Mss. Box 141/10a, Pakington to Derby, 18 February 1862.
(3) For example, Educational Guardian, 20 December 1861, 196-7 and 1 May 1862, 10.
(4) Educational Guardian, 1 December 1862, 204.

In 1870, when commenting upon the provisions of Forster's Bill, Pakington asked "that the supply not only of teachers should be considered, but of well-trained and qualified teachers," (1) and four years later he called the attention of Richmond to the problem of supplying teachers for schools for the middle classes. A deputation from the College of Preceptors had waited upon the Lord President on 16 April 1874 to ask for the professional training of teachers for upper and middle class schools. In June, therefore, Pakington asked Richmond whether the Government intended to act upon this issue, and himself urged that the teacher training system should be extended to provide a trained profession for all schools. (2) Pakington held a consistent attitude towards the importance of a supply of good teachers to ensure national education. He wanted well-trained teachers and his exchange of letters with Derwent Coleridge (3) which reflected his concern that those who had been trained should not betake themselves to other professions or pursuits, was in no sense an attack upon the principle of training as such. Though he regretted that insistence upon certification prevented the extension of government grants to many schools, even on this issue he was sufficiently persuaded by the evidence presented to his Select Committee in 1865 on the importance of certification for securing good quality schools as to adhere to that principle, but to seek some extension by recommending the combination of small schools under the superintendence of a trained teacher.

Good schools, for Pakington, thus meant schools with sufficient accommodation and trained staff, in which a

---

(1) Hansard, CCII, 567, 20 June 1870. Pakington was particularly concerned here with religious teaching.
(2) Hansard, CCXX, 601, 29 June 1874.
(3) Correspondence printed in the Monthly Paper of the National Society, April 1855, 74-5.

full and appropriate curriculum, including religious education, was taught to pupils who regularly attended over a seven year period which extended at least until their twelfth year. Cutnall Green School was described as one of the worst free schools in Worcestershire in the first half of the nineteenth century. (1) Its master, John Evans, had taught there for twenty years, as had his father for thirty-seven years before him. But John Evans had bad health and could not spell words of two syllables, whilst the windows of the schoolroom were glazed with wood. On 7 November 1849 a special meeting was held for the purpose of providing a new feoffment and Pakington was listed as one of the new trustees. He described his own part in this enterprise in his evidence to the Taunton Commission.

"It is a case where there existed a wretched little endowment to provide gratuitous education for 30 children from each of two small parishes. I am myself largely interested, being the proprietor of the whole of an adjoining parish, still too small for a good school for the education of the working classes, and another gentleman, Mr. Foster, the member for South Staffordshire, is largely interested in a fourth parish. I proposed to Mr. Foster that we should avail ourselves of this little endowment to endeavour to establish a really good school for these four contiguous parishes, each of which was too small to attempt to establish satisfactory schools for themselves. Mr. Foster joined me in that proposal. At our own expense we erected a new school house. We applied to the Charity Commissioners to aid us in the undertaking, which they did, and we have now in that way established a very successful district school, which is in full operation, for these

---

(1) There is a description of the unreformed school in G. Griffith, The Free Schools of Worcestershire (1852), 120-1. Pakington appears to have been much influenced by the improvements effected at Cutnall Green.

four parishes. It is in that school that the system referred to has been adopted. The system is this: We call upon those who are the occupiers of more than 20 acres of land to pay 10s. per quarter; we call upon small tradesmen and occupiers of less than 20 acres of land to pay 5s. per quarter, and we call upon the labouring children to pay threepence per week. We have found no objection to this plan, and the practical result at this moment is that, with an attendance of somewhere between 70 and 80 children at the school, we find there are three children in the school at this time at the higher rate of 10s. per quarter and 12 children at the second rate of 5s. per quarter." (1) Crucial in this transformation was the replacement of Evans by "a very good trained and certificated schoolmaster". (2) Pakington recounted to Lord Taunton how, some years earlier, he had for the first time rode up to the schoolhouse at Cutnall Green, and found a few boys playing in the dirt around the school door. Eventually the schoolmaster appeared. "There was a man walking down the turnpike road in attendance upon a cart; he was following his cart, his main business being to make what living he could out of the few acres of land which constituted this endowment, while the boys were playing about in the dirt at the door." (3)

Pakington's evidence to Taunton confirmed his belief in the importance of securing good teachers for all types of school. The master of an endowed or grammar school was considered to have a freehold in his office, but Pakington thought it essential if such schools were to be improved in quality that the power of dismissal should exist on grounds of proved incompetence. (4) He also believed that

---

(1) A. 7015.
(2) A. 7027.
(3) A. 7025.
(4) A. 7043, 7046-8.

endowed parochial and grammar schools should be subjected to regular inspection "as a most useful stimulus to keep these schools in good order." (1) Pakington relied upon inspectors' reports for his evidence on the poor quality of many schools. In support of his Bill of 1855 he quoted from H.M.I. Kennedy who had written that "a majority of our national schools are inefficient, and discreditable ... ." (2) In his speech at the Manchester Athenaeum in 1856 he referred to the findings of H.M.I. Norris who reported in the Shropshire area the existence of "town parishes that had long outgrown the strength of their overworked and underpaid curates; monster villages that had sprung up around the newly-opened mines of some hard-headed, hard-hearted contractor; and the estate, it might be, of some large landed proprietor, who did not wish to see the people educated ... ." (3) In the following year at Birmingham Pakington maintained "that the real remedy for most of the defects of the present system was to be found in a determined effort by Government and the legislature to improve the quality of our schools." (4) Such indeed was the purpose of Pakington's attempts at legislation. As he said in moving the second reading of his Bill of 1855, "I seek, at any rate ultimately, to bring a good school within the reach of every door." (5)

Pakington's concept of national education was thus as rich and varied as the man himself, and it is to be regretted that it was never enshrined in an educational treatise. Such a work, had it existed, might well have enabled him to resolve some of his inconsistencies, and to provide both a clear blueprint for educational advance in his own century, and a sound means for the better appreciation of that education in the next.

---

(1) A, 7051. See also 7052 and 7057-60, for Pakington's replies on the value of inspection for all schools.
(2) Hansard, CXXXVIII, 1816, 11 June 1855.
(3) The Times, 20 November 1856.
(4) The Times, 14 October 1857.
(5) Hansard, CXXXVII, 2113, 2 May 1855.

Chapter Ten

CONCLUSION

By 1874 it could be maintained that Pakington "had long ceased to be of much account in a House of Commons many of the members of which were at school whilst he was administering the affairs of the Colonies." (1) It has also been suggested that during the last decade of his life Pakington was as a speaker, "dull, pompous and tedious, and constantly mistook platitudes for arguments," and, if the counting out story is to be believed, that "his own friends regarded him as such an intolerable bore that they refused to listen to him." (2) On his death in 1880, in a condescending leading article which made no mention of his work for education, The Times concluded "He always bore the reputation of a laborious and conscientious official; but his public achievements were confined to a share in the reconstruction of the Navy and the contribution of a striking though not very fortunate phrase to the political history of his time." (3)

But if there is evidence to suggest that Pakington was, or became, a pompous bore, the classic example of mediocrity raised above his station to Cabinet rank by an accident of political history, and consequently a failure both as First Lord and as Minister of War, (4) there is also evidence to the contrary, and evidence enough to suggest that Disraeli's disparagements, if not Derby's

---

(1) H.W. Lucy, Men and Manner in Parliament (1874), 6-7.
(2) W. Jeans, Parliamentary Reminscences (1912), 43-4. In 1871 a slip, which originated from the Conservative side, marked "We want to count Pakington", was passed to Forster who was speaking at the time. He to his credit tore it up but the pieces were collected and passed to Pakington.
(3) The Times, 10 April 1880. The reference is to "The Ten Minutes Bill".
(4) H.W. Lucy, Men and Manner in Parliament (1874), 5-9 makes such a judgement.

jests, were prompted as much by genuine apprehension and rivalry as by contempt. For Pakington was an important political figure in the 1850's, and Conservative leaders were unable to dispense with his services as a front bench spokesman until his electoral defeat of 1874. Moreover Pakington was, as his diaries and personal correspondence show, a compassionate, tender-hearted man with a broad span of interests which he pursued with vigour and resolve.

Education was one of those interests, but in education as in politics Pakington has generally been consigned to the footnotes of history. This neglect is understandable and to some extent merited. Whereas Russell has been identified with the genesis of the Committee of Privy Council in 1839, Kay-Shuttleworth with the Minutes of 1846 and the provision of a teaching force, Lowe with the Revised Code, and Forster with the 1870 Act, Pakington, a politician of the other side, appears to have no single particular achievement in the history of education to his credit. Even his parentage of the Newcastle Commission has been dismissed as an unplanned and isolated incident. But, as this study has attempted to show, Pakington was a vital link, perhaps the vital link, between such elements in the history of education as the rival Manchester groups, between the abortive legislation of the 1850's and the Newcastle Commission, between the Revised Code and the overthrow of Lowe, between the Bills of 1857 and 1867, between the Select Committee of 1865-6, itself an attempt to continue the reform which Pakington had achieved in 1856, and the Act of 1870. There can be no doubt that he played a major role in the history of Parliament, politics and education in the middle years of the nineteenth-century.

A proper understanding of this role has considerable implications for current studies of nineteenth century education and society, and in particular for those which seek to emphasize the class divisions of that society without at the same time noting the cohesive forces, for

example those of nationalism and religion [1] which were also at work. For example Brian Simon's comment on the 1870 Act that "It was only after the education of the upper and middle classes had been brought into some kind of order that attention was turned to evolving a system of elementary schools for the working class," [2] cannot be applied to Pakington. For in seeking to promote national education he firstly directed his attention to those who were unable to help themselves, and secondly hoped to provide the working classes with an education of such quality that members of other social groups would wish to share therein. Similarly in the same work attention is focused on "some of the influences at work which sharply differentiated the leading citizens of Birmingham and Manchester from the England of Whig and Tory, parson and squire, Established Church and traditional universities." [3] Pakington's life was an attempt to bridge these gaps; a Tory squire, a product, as were his two sons, of England's oldest university, a strong supporter of the local parson and the Established Church, he was at the same time, on account of his appreciation of industrial and commercial society and its educational needs, welcomed and honoured by their leading citizens in those very cities of Birmingham and Manchester. There he acted in concert in educational matters with representatives of Dissent and Secularism, just as in Parliament he collaborated with Liberals and Radicals, and in the New Social Movement with the leaders of working men. Finally though it has been concluded that "In the period 1850-70 a conscious effort was made to establish a closed system of schools; so to divide and differentiate the education given to different social classes that privilege could for

---

(1) These can of course also be interpreted in class terms.
(2) B. Simon, The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870 (1974), 14.
(3) Ibid., 17.

ever withstand the pressure of the working masses," (1) the evidence of Pakington's career, at least, in not consistent with such an analysis.

Pakington's contribution to national education can only be appreciated in a national context. During the nineteenth century English society was being transformed by such forces as population explosion, industrialization, urbanization and the rise of bureaucracy. This transformation had considerable implications for education, implications which Pakington appreciated, though understandably his appreciation was at times confused and contradictory. He appreciated firstly that, for a variety of reasons, this new society would require a much greater quantity of educational provision than hitherto. He himself therefore supported voluntary organizations, at national level through the National Society and the Church of England Education Society, at regional level through the Worcester Diocesan Board, at individual level in a variety of educational institutions from Cutnall Green and the Droitwich Mechanics' Institute to Wellington College. In addition, as his parliamentary career particularly shows, he sought to provide an effective state presence in education with both the appointment of a Minister of Education of Cabinet rank, and the establishment of a new local system of rate-financed elected boards.

Pakington appreciated, too, that the quality of educational provision would need to be commensurate with the improved quality of life which it was hoped that the new society would be able to provide for all members of the nation. For example, the original purpose of the National Society, namely the education of the poor in the principles of the Established Church, was quite inadequate,

---

(1) Ibid., 366.

in Pakington's view, as an expression of the purpose of national education. It was inadequate precisely because it implied narrow and exclusive tendencies in such matters as curriculum, social class and religious faith. Pakington, on the other hand, emphasized the need for broad curricula, a general core of elementary subjects and a variety of choices at secondary level and above, with a particular emphasis upon scientific and technical education as a corrective to the classical tradition. His position on social cohesion was even more striking. Though one must acknowledge the limitations, Pakington did see the schoolroom as a unifying social force. Thirdly he stood firmly against that sectarian rivalry which, for all its achievements, he considered to be the main impediment to the achievement of national education.

Pakington's concept of national education is not to be found in any closely reasoned treatise. Rather must it be culled from his speeches and actions, speeches which were often characterized by "A certain simplicity of mind, combined with an amusing weightiness of manner," and which were almost always "insupportably prolix". (1) But though he was at times inconsistent, and displayed both personal and political weaknesses, his commitment to the cause of education, even at the risk of his own personal and political advancement, cannot be questioned. As James Augustus St. John wrote in dedicating The Education of the People to Pakington, "I have found it impossible to consider the question at all, without meeting at every step some fresh proof of your public spirit. Through the agency of associations, through meetings, through conferences, as well as through the influence of debates in Parliament,

---

(1) H.W. Lucy, Men and Manner in Parliament (1874), 8-9.

you have laboured to impart to the people of this country the incalculable blessings of knowledge ... ." (1)

But Pakington himself provided a more succint statement of his claim to a genuine place in history. In 1856, a year of success, he signed two letters to The Times simply and accurately as, 'A Promoter of Education'. (2)

---

(1) J.A. St. John, The Education of the People (1858).
(2) The Times, 18 March and 1 April 1856.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography is arranged on the following plan (works of reference are not included):

A. MANUSCRIPT AND OTHER COLLECTIONS

B. PARLIAMENT

C. NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

D. BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, PRINTED SPEECHES etc.

   1. Published before 1900
   2. Published since 1900

E. ARTICLES

F. THESES

A. MANUSCRIPT AND OTHER COLLECTIONS

1. British Library

Aberdeen Papers
Bright Papers
Cobden Papers
Gladstone Papers
Iddesleigh Papers
Peel Papers
Ripon Papers

2. Department of Education and Science Library

Education Miscellanies
Education Pamphlets

3. Hughenden Manor

Hughenden (Disraeli) Papers

4. National Society Record Office

National Society Annual Reports
National Society General Committee Minute Books
Worcester Diocesan Board of Education Reports

5. The Queen's College, Oxford

Derby Papers

6. Public Record Office

Cairns Papers
Education Department Papers
Granville Papers
Russell Papers

7. St. Helen's Record Office, Worcester

Curtler and Hallmark Papers
Hampton Papers

8. University College, London

Brougham Papers

9. West Sussex Record Office, Chichester

Cobden Papers

B. PARLIAMENT

1. Debates

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates - particularly the years 1837 - 1880.

House of Commons Journals.

House of Lords Journals.

2. Acts

3 & 4 Vict. c. 61,	Sale of Beer Act, 1840.
3 & 4 Vict. c. 77,	Grammar Schools Act, 1840.
4 & 5 Vict. c. 38,	School Sites Act, 1841.
7 & 8 Vict. c. 37,	School Sites Act, 1844.
7 & 8 Vict. c. 92,	County Coroners Act, 1844.
10 & 11 Vict. c. 82,	Juvenile Offenders Act, 1847.
13 & 14 Vict. c. 11,	District Schools Act, 1850.
13 & 14 Vict. c. 37,	Larceny Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1850.
15 & 16 Vict. c. 49,	School Sites Act, 1852.
16 & 17 Vict. c. 137,	Charitable Trusts Act, 1853.
17 & 18 Vict. c. 86,	Reformatory and Industrial Schools Act, 1854.
17 & 18 Vict. c. 81,	Oxford University Act, 1854.
18 & 19 Vict. c. 34,	Education of Pauper Children Act, 1855.
18 & 19 Vict. c. 131,	School Grants Act, 1855.
19 & 20 Vict. c. 116,	Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education Act, 1856.
20 & 21 Vict. c. 48,	Industrial Schools Act, 1857.
20 & 21 Vict. c. 55,	Reformatory Schools Act, 1857.
23 & 24 Vict. c. 136,	Charitable Trusts Act, 1860.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 113,	Industrial Schools Act, 1861.
25 & 26 Vict. c. 43,	Education of Pauper Children Act, 1862.
25 & 26 Vict. c. 112,	Charitable Trusts Act, 1862.
30 & 31 Vict. c. 102,	Representation of the People Act, 1867.
31 & 32 Vict. c. 32,	Endowed Schools Act, 1868.

31 & 32 Vict. c. 118, Public Schools Act, 1868.
32 & 33 Vict. c. 40, Sunday and Ragged Schools Act, 1869.
32 & 33 Vict. c. 56, Endowed Schools Act, 1869.
33 & 34 Vict. c. 75, Elementary Education Act, 1870.
36 & 37 Vict. c. 67, Agricultural Children Act, 1873.
36 & 37 Vict. c. 87, Endowed Schools Act, 1873.
37 & 38 Vict. c. 87, Endowed Schools Act, 1874.
39 & 40 Vict. c. 79, Elementary Education Act, 1876.
43 & 44 Vict. c. 23, Elementary Education Act, 1880.

3. Bills

1850, ii, 463, Bill to promote the Secular Education of the People in England and Wales.

1852-3, iii, 235, Bill for the promotion of Education in Cities and Boroughs in England.

1854-5, ii, 235, Bill to promote Education in England.

1854-5, ii, 245, Bill for the better encouragement and promotion of Education in England.

1854-5, ii, 461, Bill to establish Free Schools in England and Wales.

1857, i, 95, Bill to promote Education in Corporate Cities and Boroughs in England and Wales.

1867, ii, 683, Bill to provide for the Education of the Poorer Classes in England and Wales.

1867-8, ii, 359, Bill to provide for Elementary Education in England and Wales.

H. of L. 1867-8, iv, 227, Bill to regulate the Distribution of Sums granted by Parliament for Elementary Education in England and Wales; and for other Purposes.

4. Annual Reports

Committee of Council on Education, Minutes, 1839-1858.
Committee of Council on Education, Reports, 1859-1880.
Department of Science and Art, Reports, 1854-1880.

5. Reports of Royal Commissions

1834, xxvii, 1, Report from His Majesty's Commissioners for Inquiry into the Administration and Practical Operation of the Poor Law.

1859, vi, 1, Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the best means of Manning the Navy.

1861, xxi, 1, Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State of Popular Education in England.

1864, xx, 1, Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Revenues and Management of certain Colleges and Schools, and the Studies pursued and the instruction given therein.

1867-8, xxviii, 1, Report of the Royal Commissioners on Schools not comprised within Her Majesty's two recent Commissions on Popular Education and Public Schools.

1868-9, xxii, 1, First Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Present State of Military Education, and into the Training of Candidates for Commissions in the Army.

1871, xix, 1, Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Administration and Operation of the Contagious Diseases Acts.

1888, xxxv, 1, Final Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Elementary Education Acts, England and Wales.

6. Reports of Select Committees

1842, xiii, 1, Report from the Select Committee on West India Colonies.

1852, xi, 1, First Report from the Select Committee on Education (Manchester and Salford etc.).

1852-3, xxiv, 301, Second Report from the Select Committee on Education (Manchester and Salford etc.).

1854-5, ix, 1, Report from the Select Committee on the Army before Sebastopol.

1861, vii, 395, Report from the Select Committee on the Education of Destitute Children.

1864, ix, 13, Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into Inspectors' Reports.

1865, vi, 1, First Report of the Select Committee on the Constitution of the Committee of Council on Education.

1866, vii, 115, Second Report of the Select Committee on the Constitution of the Committee of Council on Education.

1866, xi, 523, Special Report of the Select Committee on the Contagious Diseases Bill.

1867-8, xv, 1, Report from the Select Committee on Scientific Instruction.

1868-9, vii, 1, Report from the Select Committee on the Contagious Diseases Act, 1866.

1868-9, viii, 741, Report from the Select Committee on the Endowed Schools Bill.

1868-9, viii, 763, Report from the Select Committee on the Endowed Schools (No. 2) Bill.

7. Other Parliamentary Papers

1852-3, lxxxix, 1, Census of Great Britain, 1851. Religious Worship (England and Wales).

1852-3, xc, 1, Census of Great Britain, 1851. Education (England and Wales).

1862, xli, 115, Minute ... establishing a Revised Code of Regulations and Copies of all Memorials, Letters and Correspondence.

1870, liv, 265, Return, confined to the Municipal Boroughs of Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, and Manchester, of all Schools for the Poorer Classes of Children ... .

C. NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

Birmingham Daily Gazette

Birmingham Journal

Cheltenham Journal

Daily News

Daily Telegraph
Edinburgh Review
Educational Expositor
Educational Guardian
Educational Record
Frasers Magazine
Lyttelton Times
Manchester Examiner and Times
Manchester Guardian
Monthly Paper of the National Society
Morning Chronicle
Morning Post
Punch
Quarterly Review
Scotsman
Standard
Times
Westminster Review
Worcester Herald
Worcestershire Advertiser
Worcestershire Chronicle

D. BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, PRINTED SPEECHES etc.

(The place of publication is London, unless otherwise stated.)

1. Published before 1900

Adams, F., History of the Elementary School Contest in England, 1882.

Adderley, Sir C.B., Punishment is not Education, 1856.

Adderley, Sir C.B., A Few Thoughts on National Education and Punishments, 1874.

Akroyd, E., On Factory Education and its Extension ..., Leeds, 1858.

Applegarth, R., Compulsory Attendance at School. The Working Men's View, Birmingham, 1870.

Arnold, M., Culture and Anarchy: an essay in social and political criticism, 1869.

Arnold, M., Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852-1882, (edited by Sir F. Sandford), 1889.

Baines, E., The Social, Educational and Religious State of the Manufacturing Districts, 1843.

Baines, E., The Rival Educational Projects, 1851.

Baines, E., Strictures on the New Government Measure of Education, 1853.

Baines, E., Education best promoted by Perfect Freedom, not by State Endowments, 1854.

Baines, E., National Education. Remarks on the speech and plan of Lord John Russell, 1856.

Baines, E., National Education, 1867.

Baines, M.A., A Comprehensive View of National Education Schemes: their past fallacies and future prospects: being a review of education measures during the session of 1856, 1856.

Baines, M.A., The Educational Conference: its probable results: being a digest of the proceedings on June 22nd and 24th: with some remarks upon the compulsory system and voluntary principle, 1857.

Barry, A., The Present Duty of Churchmen towards National Education, 1871.

Baynes, C.R., National Religious Education: its possibility suggested, 1871.

Bazley, T., National Education, What should it be?, Manchester, 1858.

Bennett, W.J.E., Crime and Education: the duty of the State therein, 1846.

Biber, G.E., Bishop Blomfield and his Times, 1857.

Bickersteth, E., The Conscience Clause: a letter to ... the Duke of Marlborough, etc., 1867.

Birks, T.R., The "Great Fact", on which the Revised Code rests, tried by its own witnesses, and proved to be a gross fallacy; or a four-fold proof from the data of the Commissioners' Report, 1862.

Birks, T.R., The Revised Code and the Report of the Royal Commission on Education, tried by the new arithmetical test, 1862.

Birks, T.R., The Revised Code: what would it do? and what should be done with it?, 1862.

Blomfield, A., A Memoir of C.J. Blomfield, Bishop of London, 2 vols., 1863.

Booth, J., Examination the Province of the State; or, the Outlines of a practical system for the extension of national education, 1847.

Bowring, Sir J., Autobiographical Recollections of Sir John Bowring, 1877.

Bromby, C.H., Review of Sir John Pakington's Bill on Public Education ... Extracted from "Papers for the Schoolmaster", 1855.

Bromby, C.H., A letter to the Right Hon. Robert Lowe, M.P., containing strictures upon the false assumptions and inadequate remedies of the Revised Education Code, 1861.

Bromby, C.H., Revised Educational Code. A letter to the Right Hon. Earl Granville, 1861.

Brougham, Lord, The Life and Times of Henry Lord Brougham, 3 vols., Edinburgh and London, 1871.

Bulwer, W.H.L.E., The Life of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston, 3 vols., 1870-4.

Burgess, R., National Education, by Rates or Taxes. A letter addressed to ... Sir George Grey Bart, 1855.

Campbell, Hon. D., Compulsory Education, 2nd ed., 1870.

Campbell, J.A., The Education Question ..., Glasgow, 1871.

Carpenter, M., The Claims of Ragged Schools to pecuniary educational aid from the annual parliamentary grant, as an integral part of the educational movement of the country, London and Bristol, 1859.

Carpenter, M., An Address read at the Conference on Ragged Schools held in Birmingham, Birmingham, 1861.

Central Committee of Schoolmasters, Returns concerning the Assistant Commissioners of Education and Inspected Schools, in the Ten Specimen Districts, 1862.

Chadwick, Sir E., National Elementary Education. An Address, 1868.

Chadwick, Sir E., National Education. Letter thereon to the Lord President of the Council, 1870.

Chadwick, Sir E., On the New Education Bill, 1870.

Chamberlain, J., The Educational Policy of the Government from a Nonconformist point of view, Birmingham, 1872.

Chamberlain, J., Increase of Grants to Denominational Schools, 1876.

Chamberlain, J., Six years of Educational Work in Birmingham. An address, delivered to the Birmingham School Board, Birmingham, 1876.

Chase, D.P., The Rights of "Indigentes" in respect to College Foundations. A letter addressed to the Rt. Hon. Sir J. Pakington, Bart. M.P., Oxford, 1856.

Chester, H., Schools for Children and Institutes for Adults. An address on national education, 1860.

Chester, H., The Proper Limits of the State's interference in Education. An address, 1861.

Church of England Education Society, Annual Reports, 1854, 1855, 1857, 1858.

Close, F., National Education. The secular system, the Manchester Bill, and the Government scheme contrasted, 1852.

Close, F., The Spirit of the Debate in the House of Commons, on education, on the nights of the 10th and 11th April 1856 and the probable practical results, 1856.

Close, F., A few more words on Education Bills, 1856.

Close, F., Memorials of Dean Close. Edited by One who knew him, London and Carlisle, 1885.

Cole, Sir H., Fifty Years of Public Work, 2 vols., 1884.

Coleridge, D., The Education of the People. A Letter to the Right Hon. Sir John Coleridge, 1861.

Coleridge, D., Compulsory Education and Rate-Payment, 1867.

Collings, J., An Outline of the American School System; with remarks on the establishment of common schools in England, Birmingham, 1868.

Collins, W.L., The Education Question: Revision a Necessity, London and Edinburgh, 1862.

Colquhoun, J.C., On the Measures to be now taken, in order to secure a good National Education, 1853.

Colquhoun, J.C., Remarks on Sir John Pakington's Education Bill. In a letter to the Right Hon. S.H. Walpole M.P., 1855.

Colquhoun, J.C., Misconceptions concerning the Educational Grant, 1860.

Convocation of York, Report to Convocation of the Committee on Education, Manchester, 1870.

Craik, Sir H., The State in its Relation to Education, 1884.

Davies, C.G., Educational Difficulties; How are they to be met?, 1857.

Davies, J., The Educational Question, viewed chiefly in its financial aspect ..., 1857.

Dawes, R., Remarks occasioned by the Present Crusade against the Educational Plans of the Committee of Council on Education, 1850.

Dawes, R., Schools and other Similar Institutions for the Industrial Classes, 1853.

Denison, G.A., A Reply to the Committee of the Promoters of the Manchester and Salford Education Scheme, 1851.

Denison, G.A., A Reply to the Editor of the Manchester Guardian and to William Entwistle, 1851.

Denison, G.A., The Position and Prospects of the National Society, 1853.

Denison, G.A., The "Conscience Clause", London and Oxford, 1866.

Denison, G.A., What is the Government Bill? National elementary education. A letter to the Right Hon. Gathorne Hardy, 1868.

Denison, G.A., Notes of my Life, 1805-78, London and Oxford, 1878.

Denison, Sir W., National Elementary Education, 1868.

Dircks, H., Popular Education. A series of papers on the nature, objects, and advantages of Mechanics' Institutions, Liverpool, 1840.

Disraeli, B., Lord George Bentinck: a political biography, 1852.

Disraeli, R. (ed.), Lord Beaconsfield's Letters,1830-52, 1887.

Dufton, J., National Education, What it is and what it should be, 1847.

Dufton, J., The Prison and the School: a letter to Lord John Russell, 1848.

Dunn, H., A Few Words on the present state of the Education Question, 1870.

Dunn, H., Healing Words: a letter to the Right Hon. W.E. Forster, on the opposition raised to the Education Bill, 1872.

Enfield, Viscountess (ed.), Leaves from the Diary of Henry Greville, 2 vols., 1883-4.

Fitch, J.G., The Relative Importance of Subjects Taught in Elementary Schools, 1854.

Fitch, J.G., Public Education. Why is a New Code Wanted?, 1861.

Fitch, J.G., The Royal Commission of Inquiry into the State of Middle Class Education, 1865.

Fitch, J.G., Memorandum on the Working of the Free School System in America, France and Belgium, 1891.

Fletcher, G., Parliamentary Portraits, 3rd series 1862, 4th series 1881.

Fletcher, J., Education, National Voluntary and Free, 1851.

Girdlestone, E., The Committee of Council on Education, an imaginary enemy, a real friend, 1850.

Girdlestone, E., The Education Question, 1852.

Glasgow Public School Association, Memorial on behalf of a National System of Education, addressed to the Right Hon. the Earl of Granville, 1854.

Gordon, A.H., The Earl of Aberdeen, 1893.

Greville, C.C.F., The Greville Memoirs, 8 vols., 1888.

Griffith, G., The Free Schools of Worcestershire, and their fulfilment, 1852.

Grote, J., A few words on the New Educational Code and the Report of the Education Commissioners, Cambridge, 1862.

Hamilton, H.P., The Privy Council and the National Society, 1850.

Harris, W., The History of the Radical Party in Parliament, 1885.

Henley, J.W., Education Speech ... in the House of Commons ... May the 3rd (1855) on moving that the Bill for the better promoting National Education be read this day six months, 1855.

Hill, A. (ed.), Essays upon educational subjects, read at the educational conference of June 1857. With a short account of the objects and proceedings of the meeting, 1857.

Hill, F., National Education, its present state and prospects, 2 vols., 1836.

Hodder, E., The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, 3 vols., 1886.

Hodder, E., The Life of Samuel Morley, 2nd ed., 1887.

Hogan, J.F., Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke, 1893.

Holman, H., English National Education, 1898.

Holyoake, G.J., Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life, 2 vols., 1892.

Hook, W.F., On Means of rendering more efficient the education of the people, 1846.

Hort, F.J.A., Thoughts on the Revised Code of Education, its purposes and probable effects, Cambridge, 1862.

Jones, A., The principles of Privy Council Legislation, Edinburgh, 1859.

Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir J., Public Education, 1853.

Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir J., Letter to Earl Granville, K.G., on the Revised Code, London and Manchester, 1861.

Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir J., Four Periods of Public Education, 1862.

Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir J., Memorandum on Popular Education, 1868.

Kingscote, H., Sir John Pakington's plan. A reply to the "Remarks" of J.C. Colquhoun, 1855.

Laing, S., Notes of a Traveller, 2nd series 1850.

Lang, A., Life, Letters. and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote, first Earl of Iddesleigh, 2 vols., Edinburgh and London, 1890.

Leader, R.E., Life and Letters of John Arthur Roebuck, 1897.

Lewis, Sir G.F. (ed.), Letters of Sir G.C. Lewis, 1870.

Lowe, R., Primary and Classical Education, Edinburgh, 1867.

Lowe, R., Middle Class Education. Endowment or Free Trade, 1868.

Lucy, H.W., Men and Manner in Parliament, 1874.

Malmesbury, Earl of., Memoirs of an ex-Minister, 2 vols., 1884.

Mann, H., National Education, 1869.

Martin, A.P., Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Robert Lowe, 2 vols., 1893.

McKerrow, J.M., Memoir of William McKerrow D.D., 1891.

Meyrick, F., Denominational inspection and religious examination in Church of England Schools ... , 1870.

Miall, A., Life of Edward Miall, 1884.

Miall, C.S., Henry Richard, M.P., 1889.

Miller, J.C., Which? or Neither? An examination of the Education Bills of Lord J. Russell and Sir J.S. Pakington, Birmingham and London, 1855.

Morley, J., The Struggle for National Education, 1873.

Morley, J., The Life of Richard Cobden, 2 vols., 1881.

Morrison, W.R., The recent changes in the Revised Code examined, 1862.

Morrison, W.R., The Re-revised Code at variance with the facts proved before the Royal Commission on Education, 1862.

Mortimer, T., Compulsory Education, inconsistent with freedom and inimical to knowledge, 1859.

Moss, J.F., Notes on National Education in Continental Europe, 1873.

National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Transactions, 28 vols., 1858-85.

National Education League, Verbatim Report of the Proceedings of a Deputation ... on Wednesday, March 9, 1870, Birmingham, 1870.

National Education Union, Authorized Report of the Conference held at Leeds, 8 December 1869, 1869.

Nunn, J., Facts and Fallacies on the condition of Popular Education in Manchester, Manchester, 1866.

Nunn, J., Strictures on the Reports on Education in Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham and Leeds ... , 1870.

Paget, C., Results of an Experiment on the Half-Time System of Education in Rural Districts, 1859.

Pakington, Sir J.S., Colonial Church ... Speech ... in the House of Commons on Wednesday, May 19, 1852 on the second reading of the Colonial Church Bill, 1852.

Pakington, Sir J.S., Speech in the House of Commons on March 16, 1855 on moving for leave to introduce a Bill for the better promotion of National Education, 1855.

Pakington, Sir J.S., National Education. Address delivered ... to the Members of the Manchester Athenaeum, November 18th, 1856, 1856.

Pakington, Sir J.S., State of the Navy. Speech delivered ... on introducing the Navy Estimates, February 25, 1859, 1859.

Parker, C.S., (ed.), Sir Robert Peel from his Private Papers, 3 vols., 1899.

Peel, Sir R., Memoirs, 2 vols., 1856-7.

Playfair, L., On Primary and Technical Education, Edinburgh, 1870.

Potter, E., A letter to the Right Hon. H.A. Bruce, M.P. on Compulsory Education, 1868.

Pound, W., A Letter in reply to papers issued by the Committee of the Church Education Society, in July 1852, and January 1853, 1853.

Pound, W., Remarks upon English Education in the nineteenth century, 1866.

Ragged Schools, Authorized Report of the Conference held in Birmingham, January 23rd, 1861. Ragged Schools in Relation to the Government Grants for Education, Birmingham and London, 1861.

Reid, T.W., Cabinet Portraits, 1872.

Reid, T.W., Life of the Right Hon. W.E. Forster, 2 vols., 1888.

Richard, H., Memoirs of Joseph Sturge, 1864.

Richson, C., A Comparison of two Educational Bills of 1852. A letter to Silas Schwabe Esq ... , 1852.

Richson, C., Education in Trade Schools necessary to Promote National Education, Manchester, 1853.

Richson, C., Education. The Government measure shown to be susceptible of improvement on its own principles, London and Manchester, 1853.

Richson, C., The Agencies and Organization required in a National System of Education, London and Manchester, 1856.

Richson, C., The Difficulties of the Education Question, 1859.

Rigg, J.H., The Present Position of Methodism in Regard to National Education and the Denominational System, 1869.

Rigg, J.H., England's National System of Education, 1871.

Roberts, C.R., National Education. How not to do it, with hints as how to do it ... , 1869.

Robins, S., A Speech delivered by the Reverend Sanderson Robins at the Meeting of the National Society, 4 June 1851, 1851.

Robins, S., Twenty reasons for accepting the Revised Educational Code, 1862.

Rooker, W.S., National Education in England and Wales, 1870.

Russell, J. Scott, The Fleet of the Future in 1862; or, England without a Fleet, 1862.

Russell, J. Scott, Systematic Technical Education for the English People, 1869.

St. John, J.A., The Education of the People, 1858.

Saintsbury, G.E.B., The Earl of Derby, 1892.

Shaw, M., National Education and the Conscience Clause, 1870.

Sinclair, J., Remarks on the Common School System of the United States ..., 1857.

Sinclair, J., Remarks on School Rates in England and America, 5th ed., 1867.

Smith, I. Gregory, Education or Instruction? A letter to the Right Hon. W.E. Forster, ... on the question of National Education, London and Oxford, 1869.

Smith, J.L. Clifford, Social Science Association. A Narrative of Results. A Manual for the Social Science Congress, 1882.

Spencer, H., Education: intellectual, moral and physical, 1861.

Stephen, L., Life of Henry Fawcett, 1885.

Swaine, E., Secular Free Schools a Nation's Policy, 1851.

Turberville, T.C., Worcestershire in the Nineteenth Century, Birmingham and London, 1852.

Twistleton, E. (ed.), Evidence as to the Religious Working of the Common Schools in the State of Massachusetts, 1854.

Unwin, W.J., Education the Work of the People. A letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord J. Russell ... on the resolutions for establishing a system of National Education submitted to Parliament (1856).

Unwin, W.J. (ed.), Prussian Primary Education; its Organization and Results, 1857.

Unwin, W.J. (ed.), Voluntary and Religious Education ... Minutes of the Proceedings of a Conference held at the College, Homerton, December 10th, 1856 ... and strictures on Sir John Pakington's Borough Education Bill, by E. Baines, 1857.

Vaughan, C.J., The Revised Code of the Committee of Council on Education dispassionately considered, Cambridge, 1861.

Vince, C.A., John Bright, 1898.

Walpole, Sir S., The Life of Lord John Russell, 2 vols., 1889.

Walpole, Sir S., A History of England ..., 6 vols., new ed., 1890.

West, A.E., Recollections, 1832-1886, 2 vols., 1899.

Wrigley, T., Shall the State educate the Poor?, London and Manchester, 1855.

Wrigley, T., A Plan by which the education of the people may be secured without state interference, London and Manchester, 1857.

2. Published since 1900

Adamson, J.W., English Education, 1789-1902, Cambridge, 1930.

Altick, R.D., The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900, Chicago, 1957.

Appleman, P., Madden, W.A., Wolff, M. (eds.), 1859: entering an age of crisis, Bloomington, 1959.

Archer, R.L., Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century, Cambridge, 1921.

Argles, M., South Kensington to Robbins, 1964.

Armytage, W.H.G., A.J. Mundella, 1825-1897. The Liberal background to the Labour movement, 1951.

Armytage, W.H.G., Four Hundred Years of English Education, Cambridge, 1964.

Armytage, W.H.G., The American Influence on English Education, London and New York, 1967.

Aspinall, A., Lord Brougham and the Whig Party, Manchester, 1927.

Aspinall, A., Politics and the Press, c. 1780-1850, 1949.

Auchmuty, J.J., Irish Education. A historical survey, 1937.

Auchmuty, J.J., Sir Thomas Wyse, 1791-1862. The life and career of an educator and diplomat, 1939.

Balfour, Lady F., The Life of George, Fourth Earl of Aberdeen, K.G., K.T., 2 vols., 1923.

Ball, N., Her Majesty's Inspectorate, 1839-1849, Edinburgh and London, 1963.

Barnard, H.C., A Short History of English Education. From 1760 to 1944, 1947.

Bell, H.C.F., Lord Palmerston, 2 vols., 1936.

Bell, K.N., and Morrell, W.P., Select Documents on British Colonial Policy, 1830-1860, Oxford, 1928.

Bell, Q., The Schools of Design, 1963.

Benson, A.C., and Esher, Viscount, (eds.), The Letters of Queen Victoria, 1837-1861, 3 vols., 1907.

Berwick, G.T., Close of Cheltenham, Parish Pope. A Study in the Evangelical Background to the Oxford Movement, 1945. (A typescript copy in the Cheltenham Public Library).

Best, G.F.A., Shaftesbury, 1964.

Best, G.F.A., Mid-Victorian Britain, 1851-1875, 1971.

Biddulph, Sir R., Lord Cardwell at the War Office. A history of his administration, 1868-1874, 1904.

Binns, H.B., A Century of Education, 1808-1908, 1908.

Birchenough, C., History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the present day, 1914.

Bishop, A.S., The Rise of a Central Authority for English Education, Cambridge, 1971.

Blake, R., Disraeli, 1966.

Blake, R., The Conservative Party from Peel to Churchill, 1970.

Bloomfield, B.C., A Handlist of the Papers in the Deed Box of Sir J.P. Kay-Shuttleworth, 1804-1877, 1961.

Bloomfield, B.C. (ed.), The Autobiography of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, 1964.

Bodelsen, C.A.G., Studies in Mid Victorian Imperialism, 2nd ed., 1960.

Bready, J.W., Lord Shaftesbury and Social-Industrial Progress, 1926.

Briggs, A., Victorian People, 1954.

Briggs, A., The Age of Improvement, 1959.

Briggs, A., Victorian Cities, 1963.

Broughton, Lord, Recollections of a Long Life, 6 vols., 1909-11.

Brown, C.K.F., The Church's part in Education, 1833-1941, 1942.

Buckle, G.E. (ed.), The Letters of Queen Victoria, 1862-1885, 3 vols., 1926-8.

Burgess, H.J., Enterprise in Education, 1958.

Burn, W.L., The Age of Equipoise. A study of the mid-Victorian generation, 1964.

Carrington, C.E., The British overseas. Exploits of a nation of shopkeepers, Cambridge, 1950.

Cecil, Lady G., Life of Robert, Marquis of Salisbury, 4 vols., 1921-32.

Christie, O.F., The Transition from Aristocracy, 1832-1867, 1927.

Clark, G.S.R. Kitson, The Making of Victorian England, 1962.

Clark, G.S.R. Kitson, Peel and the Conservative Party, 2nd ed., 1964.

Clementi, Sir C., A Constitutional History of British Guiana, 1937.

Conacher, J.B., The Aberdeen Coalition, 1852-1855, Cambridge, 1968.

Conacher, J.B., The Peelites and the party system, 1846-52, Newton Abbot, 1972.

Connell, B., Regina v. Palmerston, 1962.

Connell, W.F., The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold, 1950.

Cornish, F.W., The English Church in the Nineteenth Century, 1910.

Cowherd, R.G., The Politics of English Dissent, 1959.

Cowling, M., 1867, Disraeli, Gladstone and Revolution, Cambridge, 1967.

Craig, H., The Legislative Council of Trinidad and Tobago, 1952.

Cruickshank, M., Church and State in English Education. 1870 to the present day, 1963.

Cumpston, I.M., Indians Overseas in British Territories, 1834-1854, 1953.

Curtis, S.J., History of Education in Great Britain, 5th ed., 1963.

Denison, L.E. (ed.), Fifty Years at East Brent. The Letters of George Anthony Denison 1845-1896, 1902.

Dobbs, A.E., Education and Social Movements, 1700-1850, 1919.

Driver, C., Tory Radical, the life of Richard Oastler, New York, 1946.

Eaglesham, E., From School Board to Local Authority, 1956.

Egerton, H.E., A Short History of British Colonial Policy, 17th ed., 1950.

Erickson, A.B., The Public Career of Sir James Graham, Oxford, 1952.

Feuchtwanger, E.J., Disraeli, democracy and the Tory Party. Conservative leadership and organization after the second Reform Bill, Oxford, 1968.

Finer, S.E., The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick, 1952.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E., The Life of Granville George Leveson Gower, second Earl Granville, 2 vols., 1905.

Forbes, D., The Liberal Anglican Idea of History, Cambridge, 1952.

Fox, G.E., British Admirals and Chinese Pirates 1832-1869, 1940.

Fraser, P., Joseph Chamberlain: Radicalism and empire. 1868-1914, 1966.

Garnett, R., The Life of W.J. Fox, London and New York, 1910.

Garvin, J.L., The Life of Joseph Chamberlain, 4 vols., 1932.

Gash, N., Politics in the Age of Peel, 1953.

Gash, N., Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics, 1832-1852, Oxford, 1965.

Gaut, R.C., A History of Worcestershire Agriculture and Rural Evolution, Worcester, 1939.

Gill, C., Briggs, A., Sutcliffe, A., Smith, R., History of Birmingham, 3 vols., 1952-74.

Gillespie, F.E., Labor and Politics in England, 1850-1867, Durham N.C., 1927.

Goldstrom, J.M., The Social Content of Education 1808-1870: a study of the working class school reader in England and Ireland, Shannon, 1972.

Gooch, G.P., (ed.), The Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1840-1878, 2 vols., 1925.

Gordon, P., The Victorian School Manager. A Study in the Management of Education, 1800-1902, 1974.

Gosden, P.H.J.H., The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales, Oxford, 1966.

Gosden, P.H.J.H., The Evolution of a Profession: A study of the contribution of teachers' associations to the development of school teaching as a professional occupation, Oxford, 1972.

Green, F.C., A Comparative View of French and British Civilization, 1850-1870, 1965.

Guedalla, P., The Palmerston Papers. Gladstone and Palmerston, 1928.

Halévy, E., A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century, 6 vols., 1949-52.

Halévy, E., The Growth of Philosophical Radicalism, new ed., 1952.

Hall, H.L., The Colonial Office. A history, 1937.

Hamer, D.A., John Morley, liberal intellectual in politics, Oxford, 1968.

Hammond, J.L. and B., Lord Shaftesbury, 1923.

Hammond, J.L. and B., The Age of the Chartists, 1832-1854, 1930.

Hanham, H.J., Elections and Party Management. Politics in the time of Gladstone and Disraeli, 1959.

Hanham, H.J., The Nineteenth-Century Constitution, 1969.

Harrison, J.F.C., Learning and Living, 1790-1960, 1961.

Hawes, F., Henry Brougham, 1957.

Heeney, B., Mission to the Middle Classes: The Woodard Schools 1848-1891, 1969.

Hill, R.L., Toryism and the People 1832-1846, 1929.

History of Education Society, Studies in the Government and Control of Education since 1860, 1970.

History of Education Society, History, Sociology and Education, 1971.

History of Education Society, Local Studies and the History of Education, 1972.

Hollis, P. (ed.), Pressure from Without in early Victorian England, 1974.

Hurt, J., Education in Evolution: Church, State, society and popular education, 1800-1870, 1971.

Hutton, T.W., King Edward's School, Birmingham, 1552-1952, Birmingham, 1952.

Inglis, K., Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England, 1963.

Jeans, W., Parliamentary Reminiscences, 1912.

Jones, W.D., Lord Derby and Victorian Conservatism, Oxford, 1956.

Jones, W.D., The American Problem in British Diplomacy, 1841-61, 1974.

Jones, W.D., and Erickson, A.B., The Peelites, 1846-1857, Columbus, 1972.

Kennedy, A.L., Salisbury, 1830-1903: Portrait of a Statesman, 1953.

Knaplund, P., The British Empire, 1815-1939, 1942.

Knight, R., Illiberal Liberal. Robert Lowe in New South Wales, 1842-1850, Carlton, 1966.

Knox, H.M., Two Hundred and Fifty Years of Scottish Education, 1696-1946, Edinburgh and London, 1953.

Lathbury, D.C. (ed.), Correspondence on Church and Religion of W.E. Gladstone, 2 vols., 1910.

Lawson, J., and Silver, H., A Social History of Education in England, 1973.

Layton, D., Science for the People: The Origins of the School Science Curriculum in England, London and New York, 1974.

Leese, J., Personalities and Powers in English Education, Leeds, 1950.

Lewis, M.A., The Navy in Transition, 1814-1864. A social history, 1965.

Maccoby, S., English Radicalism, 1832-1852, 1935.

Maccoby, S., English Radicalism, 1853-1886, 1938.

MacDonagh, O.O.G.M., A pattern of Government growth 1800-1860. The Passenger Acts and their enforcement, 1961.

Mack, E.C., Public Schools and British Opinion 1780-1860, 1938.

Mack, E.C., The Public Schools and British Opinion since 1860, New York, 1941.

Magnus, Sir P., Gladstone. A Biography, 1954.

Mallet, C.E., A History of the University of Oxford, 3 vols., 1927.

Maltby, S.E., Manchester and the Movement for National Elementary Education, 1800-1870, Manchester, 1918.

Mathews, H.F., Methodism and the Education of the People, 1791-1851, 1949.

Maxwell, Sir H., The Life and Letters of George William Frederick, Fourth Earl of Clarendon, 2 vols., 1913.

McDowell, R.B., British Conservatism, 1832-1914, 1959.

Montmorency, J.E.G. de, State Intervention in English Education, Cambridge, 1902.

Montmorency, J.E.G. de, The Progress of Education in England, 1904.

Montmorency, J.E.G. de, National Education and National Life, 1906.

Monypenny, W.F., and Buckle, G.E., The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, 2 vol. ed., 1929.

Morison, J.L., British Supremacy and Canadian Self-government 1839-54, Glasgow, 1919.

Morley, J., The Life of William Ewart Gladstone, 3 vols., London and New York, 1903.

Morrell, W.P., The Provincial System in New Zealand, 1852-76, 2nd rev. ed., 1964.

Morrell, W.P., British Colonial Policy in the age of Peel and Russell, re-issue, 1966.

Morrell, W.P., British Colonial Policy in the Mid-Victorian Age, Oxford, 1969.

Murphy, J., Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1800-1970, 1971.

Murphy, J., The Education Act 1870, Newton Abbot, 1972.

Musgrave, P.W., Society and education in England since 1800, 1968.

Musgrave, P.W. (ed.), Sociology, History and Education, 1970.

New, C.W., The Life of Henry Brougham to 1830, Oxford, 1961.

Newsome, D., A History of Wellington College, 1859-1959, 1959.

Newsome, D., Godliness and Good Learning: four studies on a Victorian ideal, 1961.

Pakington, H., Bid time return: an autobiography, 1958.

Pakington, H. and R., The Pakingtons of Westwood, privately printed, 1975.

Parker, C.S., Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, 2 vols., 1907.

Peel, G. (ed.), The Private Letters of Sir Robert Peel, 1920.

Pemberton, W.S.C., Life of Lord Norton, the Right Honourable Sir Charles Adderley, 1909.

Perkin, H., The origins of modern English society, 1780-1880, 1969.

Petrie, Sir C., The Carlton Club, 1955.

Pollard, A.F., The British Empire, 1909.

Prest, J.M., Lord John Russell, 1972.

Ramsay, A.A.W., Sir Robert Peel, 1928.

Read, D., Cobden and Bright: a Victorian political partnership, 1967.

Redlich, J., The Procedure of the House of Commons, 3 vols., 1908.

Reid, S.J., Lord John Russell, 4th ed., 1906.

Rich, E.E., The Education Act 1870, 1970.

Rich, R.W., The Training of Teachers in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century, Cambridge, 1933.

Roach, J.P.C., Public Examinations in England 1850-1900, 1971.

Robson, A.H., The Education of Children Engaged in Industry in England, 1833-1876, 1931.

Robson, R. (ed.), Ideas and Institutions of Victorian England, 1967.

Roderick, G.W., and Stephens, M.D., Scientific and technical education in nineteenth-century England, Newton Abbot, 1972.

Rubinstein, D., School attendance in London, 1870-1904: a social history, Hull, 1969.

Saint Aubyn, G.R., The Royal George, 1814-1904. The life of H.R.H. Prince George, Duke of Cambridge, 1963.

Selleck, R.J.W., The New Education 1870-1914, 1968.

Silver, H., The Concept of Popular Education, 1965.

Silver, H., English Education and the Radicals 1780-1850, 1975.

Simon, B., The Two Nations and the Educational Structure, 1780-1870, retitled re-issue, 1974.

Simon, B., Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920, re-issue, 1974.

Smelser, N.J., Social Change in the Industrial Revolution. An application of theory to the Lancashire cotton industry 1770-1840, 1959.

Smith, Sir F., The Life and Works of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, 1923.

Smith, Sir F., A History of English Elementary Education, 1760-1902, 1931.

Smith, P., Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform, London and Toronto, 1967.

Smyth, C.H.E., Dean Milman, 1791-1868, 1949.

Southgate, D.G., The Passing of the Whigs, 1832-1886, 1962.

Southgate, D.G., 'The Most English minister ...', London and New York, 1966.

Southgate, D.G. (ed.), The Conservative leadership, 1832-1932, 1974.

Spalding, T.A., The Work of the London School Board, 1900.

Stewart, R., The Politics of Protection; Lord Derby and the Protectionist Party, 1846-1852, Cambridge, 1971.

Stewart, W.A.C., Progressives and Radicals in English education, 1750-1970, 1972.

Sturt, M., The Education of the People: a history of primary education in England and Wales in the nineteenth century, 1967.

Sutherland, G., Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century, 1971.

Sutherland, G. (ed.), Studies in the growth of nineteenth-century government, 1972.

Sutherland, G., Policy-making in elementary education, 1870-1895, 1975.

Sylvester, D.W., Robert Lowe and Education, 1974.

Taylor, R.G., Lord Salisbury, 1972.

Thirlwall, J.C., Connop Thirlwall, 1936.

Thomas, I. Bulmer, The Growth of the British Party System, 2 vols., 1965.

Thomas, J.A., The House of Commons, 1832-1901, Cardiff, 1939.

Thompson, E.P., The Making of the English Working Class, 1963.

Thompson, F.M.L., English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century, London and Toronto, 1963.

Tilby, A.W., Lord John Russell, 1930.

Trevelyan, G.M., The Life of John Bright, 1925.

Tropp, A., The School Teachers. The growth of the teaching profession in England and Wales from 1800 to the present day, 1957.

Victoria County History of the County of Worcester, 4 vols., 1901-24.

Vincent, J.R., The Formation of the Liberal Party, 1857-1868, 1966.

Wallas, G., William Johnson Fox, 1786-1864, 1924.

Walling, R.A.J. (ed.), The Diaries of John Bright, 1930.

Ward, Mrs H., A Writer's Recollections, 2 vols., London and New York, 1918.

Ward, J.M., Empire in the Antipodes. The British in Australasia: 1840-1860, 1966.

Ward, J.T., Sir James Graham, London and New York, 1967.

Ward, W.R., Victorian Oxford, 1965.

Wardle, D., English popular education 1780-1970, Cambridge, 1970.

West, E.G., Education and the State, 1965.

West, E.G., Education and the Industrial Revolution, London and Sydney, 1975.

Williams, W.E., The Rise of Gladstone to the Leadership of the Liberal Party, 1859-1868, Cambridge, 1934.

Wilson, P.W., The Greville Diary, 2 vols., 1927.

Wolf, L., Life of the First Marquess of Ripon, 2 vols., 1921.

Wrigley, E.A. (ed.), Nineteenth-Century Society: Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data, Cambridge, 1972.

Young, A.F., and Ashton, E.T., British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century, 1956.

Zetland, Marquis of (ed.), The letters of Disraeli to Lady Bradford and Lady Chesterfield, 2 vols., 1929.

E. ARTICLES

Aldrich, R.E., 'Radicalism, National Education and the Grant of 1833', Journal of Educational Administration and History, V (1), 1973.

Aldrich, R.E., 'H.H. Milman and Popular Education 1846', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (2), 1973.

Aldrich, R.E., 'Facts behind the Figures, 1839-1859', History of Education Society Bulletin, XIII, 1974.

Aldrich, R.E., 'Association of Ideas: the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science', History of Education Society Bulletin, XVI, 1975.

Aldrich, R.E., 'Uncertain Vintage, the Origins of the Church of England Education Society', History of Education Society Bulletin, XVIII, 1976.

Alexander, J., and Paz, D.G., 'The Treasury Grants, 1833-1839', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXII (1), 1974.

Armytage, W.H.G., 'The 1870 Education Act', British Journal of Educational Studies, XVIII (2), 1970.

Allsobrook, David, 'The Reform of the Endowed Schools: the work of the Northamptonshire Educational Society 1854-1874', History of Education, II (1), 1973.

Ball, Nancy, 'Elementary School Attendance and Voluntary Effort before 1870', History of Education, II (1), 1973.

Best, G.F.A., 'The Religious Difficulties of National Education in England 1800-1870', Cambridge Historical Journal, XII, 1956.

Bishop, A.S., 'Ralph Lingen, Secretary to the Education Department 1849-1870', British Journal of Educational Studies, XVI (2), 1968.

Bishop, Anthony, and Jones, Wilfred, 'The Act that never was: the Conservative Education Bill of 1868', History of Education, I (2), 1972.

Briggs, Asa, 'The Study of History of Education', History of Education, I (1), 1972.

Butterfield, P.H., 'The Educational Researches of the Manchester Statistical Society, 1830-1840', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXII (3), 1974.

Clark, E.A.G., 'The Early Ragged Schools and the foundation of the Ragged Schools Union', Journal of Educational Administration and History, I (2), 1969.

Cowling, M., 'Disraeli, Derby and Fusion, October 1865 to July 1866', Historical Journal, VIII, 1965.

Conacher, J.B., 'Peel and the Peelites, 1846-1850', English Historical Review, LXXIII, 1958.

Duke, Christopher, 'Robert Lowe - A Reappraisal', British Journal of Educational Studies, XIV (1), 1965.

Ellis, A.C.O., 'Influences on School Attendance in Victorian England', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (3), 1973.

Farrar, P.N., 'American Influence on the Movement for a National System of Elementary Education in England and Wales, 1830-1870', British Journal of Educational Studies, XIV (1), 1965.

Fletcher, Laaden, 'The Development of Periodicals addressed to Teachers in Britain before 1870', Journal of Educational Administration and History, II (2), 1970.

Fletcher, Laaden, 'Payment for Means or Payment for Results: Administrative Dilemma of the 1860's', Journal of Educational Administration and History, IV (2), 1972.

Gash, N., 'Peel and the Party System', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, I, 1951.

Gordon, Peter, 'Some Sources for the History of the School Manager, 1800-1902', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (3), 1973.

Gomez, G., 'The Endowed Schools Act, 1869 - A Middle-Class Conspiracy? The South-West Lancashire Evidence', Journal of Educational Administration and History, VI (1), 1974.

Hart, J., 'Nineteenth Century Social Reform: a Tory Interpretation of History', Past and Present, XXXI, 1965.

Horn, P.L.R., 'The Agricultural Children Act of 1873', History of Education, III (2), 1974.

Hughes, K.M., 'A Political Party and Education: Reflections on the Liberal Party's Educational Policy, 1867-1902', British Journal of Educational Studies, VII (2), 1960.

Hurt, J.S., 'Landowners, Farmers, and Clergy and the Financing of Rural Education before 1870', Journal of Educational Administration and History, I (1), 1968.

Hurt, J.S., 'Professor West on early nineteenth-century education', Economic History Review, XXIV (4), 1971.

Johnson, Richard, 'Educational Policy and Social Control in Early Victorian England', Past and Present, XLIX, 1970.

Jones, D.K., 'Lancashire, the American Common School and the Religious Problem in British Education in the Nineteenth Century', British Journal of Educational Studies, XV (3), 1967.

Jones, D.K., 'The Educational Legacy of the Anti-Corn Law League', History of Education, III (1), 1974.

Layton, David, 'The educational work of the Parliamentary Committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science', History of Education, V (1), 1976.

Leinster-Mackay, D.P., 'Dame Schools: A Need for Review', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXIV (1), 1976.

Lewis, Clyde J., 'Theory and Expediency in the Policy of Disraeli', Victorian Studies, IV (3), 1961.

MacDonagh, O.O.G.M., 'The Nineteenth-Century Revolution in Government: a Reappraisal', Historical Journal, I, 1958.

Marcham, A.J., 'The 'Myth' of Benthamism, The Second Reform Act, and the Extension of Popular Education', Journal of Educational Administration and History, II (2), 1970.

Marcham, A.J., 'A Question of Conscience: the Church and the "Conscience Clause" 1860-1870', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XXII (3), 1971.

Marcham, A.J., 'Educating our Masters: Political Parties and Elementary Education 1867-1870', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (2), 1973.

Marcham, A.J., 'The Birmingham Education Society and the 1870 Education Act', Journal of Educational Administration and History, VIII (1), 1976.

McCann, W.P., 'Elementary Education in England and Wales on the Eve of the 1870 Education Act', Journal of Educational Administration and History, II (1), 1969.

Morris, Norman, '1870: the Rating Option', History of Education, I (1), 1972.

Paz, D.G., 'The Composition of the Education Committee of the Privy Council, 1839-1856', Journal of Educational Administration and History, VIII (2), 1976.

Platten, Stephen G., 'The Conflict over the Control of Elementary Education 1870-1902 and its Effect upon the Life and Influence of the Church', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXIII (3), 1975.

Prest, J.M., 'Gladstone and Russell', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, XVI, 1966.

Riggs, R.E., 'Peel and Disraeli: Architects of a New Conservative Party', Western Humanities Review, XI, 1957.

Roberts, David, 'Tory Paternalism and Social Reform in Early Victorian England', American Historical Review, LXIII (2), 1958.

Robertson, A., 'J.G. Fitch and the Origins of the Liberal Movement in Education, 1863-70', Journal of Educational Administration and History, III (2), 1971.

Robertson, A., ' "But What is a Middle Class School?" Determining the Terms of Reference of the Taunton Commission, 1864', History of Education Society Bulletin, XVI, 1975.

Rodgers, B., 'The Social Science Association 1857-1886', Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies, XX, 1952.

Roper, Henry, 'W.E. Forster's Memorandum of 21 October, 1869: A Re-examination', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (1), 1973.

Roper, Henry, 'Toward an Elementary Education Act for England and Wales, 1865-1868', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXIII (2), 1975.

Scotland, James, 'The Centenary of the Education (Scotland) Act of 1872', British Journal of Educational Studies, XX (2), 1972.

Skelley, Alan, R., 'The Tragedy of British Military Education: The Cardwell Reforms, 1868-74', Journal of Educational Administration and History, III (2), 1971.

Smith, R.J., 'Education, Society and Literacy: Nottinghamshire in the Mid-Nineteenth Century', University of Birmingham Historical Journal, XII, 1969-70.

Stansky, P., 'Lyttelton and Thring: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Education', Victorian Studies, V (3), 1962.

Sutherland, Gillian, 'The Study of History of Education', History, LIV, 1969.

Sylvester, D.W., 'Robert Lowe and the 1870 Education Act', History of Education, III (2), 1974.

Szreter, R., 'The Origins of Full-Time Compulsory Education at Five', British Journal of Educational Studies, XIII (1), 1964.

Szreter, R., 'History and the Sociological Perspective in Educational Studies', University of Birmingham Historical Journal, XII, 1969-70.

Tholfsen, Trygve R., 'The Artisan and the Culture of Early Victorian Birmingham', University of Birmingham Historical Journal, IV, 1953-4.

Treble, James H., 'The Reaction of Chartism in the North of England to the Factory Education Bill of 1843', Journal of Educational Administration and History, VI (2), 1974.

Turner, C.M., 'Sociological Approaches to the History of Education', British Journal of Educational Studies, XVII (2), 1969.

Turner, C.M., 'Systems Theory and Social Causation in the History of Education', Education for Teaching, LXXXVI, 1971.

Ward, J.T., 'A Lost Opportunity in Education: 1843', Leeds Researches and Studies in Education, XX, 1959.

Ward, L.O., 'Technical Education and the Politicians (1870-1918)', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXI (1), 1975.

Webb, R.K., 'Working Class Readers in Early Victorian England', English Historical Review, LXV, 1950.

West, E.G., 'Resource allocation and Growth in early nineteenth-century British education', Economic History Review, XXIII (1), 1970.

West, E.G., 'The interpretation of early nineteenth-century education statistics', Economic History Review, XXIV (4), 1971.

Williams, A.R., 'A Deputation of the National Education League. March 9, 1870', History of Education Society Bulletin, XII, 1973.

F. THESES

Aldrich, R.E., 'Education and the Political Parties, 1830-1870', London M.Phil., 1970.

Burgess, H.J., 'The Work of the Established Church in the education of the people, 1833-1870', London Ph.D., 1954.

Burns, F.P., 'Steps towards a national system of education in England 1833-1870, with special reference to the Report of the Newcastle Commission 1861', Oxford B.Litt., 1965.

Gilbert, A.M., 'The work of Lord Brougham for education in England', Pennsylvania Ph.D., 1922.

Johnson, J.R.B., 'The Education Department 1839-1864: A Study in Social Policy and the Growth of Government', Cambridge Ph.D., 1968.

Leese, J., 'The History and character of educational inspection in England', London Ph.D., 1934.

Lowerson, J.R., 'The political career of Sir Edward Baines, 1800-1890', Leeds M.A., 1965.

Rich, E.E., 'The Passing of the Education Act of 1870, a Study of the formation of Public Opinion 1843-1870', London Ph.D., 1932.

Roland, D., 'The struggle for the Elementary Education Act and its implementation 1870-1873', Oxford B.Litt., 2 vols., 1957-8.

Roper, Henry, 'The Education Department for England and Wales, 1865-1885: A Study in Legislation and Administrative Response', Cambridge Ph.D., 1972.

Sullivan, J.P., 'The educational work and thought of Robert Lowe', London M.A., 1952.

Toms, V.G., 'Secular education in England 1800-1870', London Ph.D., 1972.

Ward, L.O., 'An investigation into the educational ideas and contribution of the British political parties (1870-1918)', London Ph.D., 1970.